



3 1761 11649769 4

RB 19602



Library  
of the  
University of Toronto





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761116497694>





2508

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

HEARINGS HELD AT  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

VOL. NO.

DATE

19

31 October 1966

Official Reporters

NETHERCUT & YOUNG LIMITED  
48 York Street  
TORONTO 1, ONTARIO  
TELEPHONE 363-3111





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1 IN THE MATTER OF The Public Inquiries  
2 Act, R.S.O. 1960, Ch. 323

3 - and -  
4

5 IN THE MATTER OF an Inquiry Into And  
6 Report Upon The Workmen's Compensation  
7 Act  
8

9 BEFORE: The Honourable Mr. Justice G.A.  
10 McGillivray, Commissioner, at  
11 Room 200, 67 Richmond Street  
12 West, Toronto, Ontario, on  
13 Monday, October 31, 1966.

14 APPEARANCES:

15 W.Z. Estey Q.C.) Counsel to the Commission  
16 and )  
17 H.D. Guthrie )  
18 C. R. Osler Q.C. Internation Nickel Co. of  
19 Canada Limited.

20 W.R. Kerr ) Workmen's Compensation  
21 A.G. MacDonald ) Board  
22

23 G.A. Johnston Secretary to the Commission  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

INDEX

Page No.

1	Mr. C. Pifer	2651
2	Workmen's Compensation Board	2695, 2710
3	United Steel Workers of America	2706
4	Industrial Accident Prevention Association	2708
5	M.J. Pollett, Kingston	2725
6	Mr. M. Martin	2730
7	Elman W. Campbell	2739
8	Mr. G. Charity	2741
9	Mr. Arthur L. Court	2743
10	Mr. Michael Dooley	2745
11	Mrs. Harriet King	2748
12	Mrs. Hilda Lewis	2749
13	Robert J. McKinstry	2750
14	Mr. Mel Rice	2752
15	Albert V. Walker	2757
16	Mr. Jan Ostrowski	2759
17	International Nickel Company	2772

EXHIBITS

18	44 Letter dated May 7, 1965	2679
19	45 Copy of Board's Order, December 2, 1964	2696
20	46 Letter from United Steelworkers of America dated October 24, 1966	2707
21	47 Documents received from I.A.P.A. October 28, 1966	2709
22	48 Letter dated October 25, 1966 from Canadian Tooling Manufacturers' Association	2709

-----





Nethercutt & Young

Toronto, Ontario

**1** --- At 10:00 A.M., the Hearing Commenced.

**2** THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. Estey...

3 MR. ESTEY: In the notes for today we are  
4 going to deal with the individual complainants who filed  
5 briefs before the Royal Commission, and after that we  
6 have some data and information to deal with through Mr.  
7 Kerr of the Board, and I believe there is at least one  
8 brief which has not been dealt with completely. The list  
9 of people who have filed briefs with the Commission who  
10 have not been here include A. & T. Wrecking and Salvage  
11 Company, a proprietorship in demolition, Mr. Campbell,  
12 Mr. Charity, Mr. A.L. Court, Mr. M.J. Dooley, Mrs. H. King,  
13 Mr. Lewis, Mr. R.J. McKinstry, Mr. Murdo Martin, Neptune  
14 Meters, that is an excerpt from a letter, Mr. C. Pifer,  
15 Mr. M.J. Pollett, another man in the demolition business,  
16 Mr. M. Rice and Mr. A.V. Walker.

**17** THE COMMISSIONER: Have we any appearances?

18 MR. ESTEY: I think there is only one, whom  
19 I am aware of, who is here. I believe you, sir, filed a  
20 brief?

21 MR. PIFER: Yes, sir, I have.

22 MR. ESTEY: Would you like to come forward,  
23 Mr. Pifer?

**24** MR. JOHNSON: What is your name please?

25 MR. PIFER: Conwell Pifer.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Have we the evidence  
27 submission here, Mr. Johnson?

28 MR. JOHNSON: It is in there, I believe.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: It is in here, is it?

**30** Mr. Pifer, as I think I told you -- I don't see my reply





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2652

1 to your submission here -- but it doesn't come within  
2 my province to stand on appeal, but your letter contains  
3 some general problems of policy that you want to put be-  
4 fore this Board and, if in doing so, it is necessary to  
5 relate your own circumstances that is perfectly all right  
6 but you understand from my letter that so far as decisions  
7 within their province, by the Workmen's Compensation  
8 Board are concerned, my terms of reference exclude my  
9 dealing with matters of detail which the Board have a  
10 right to deal with, but I am interested in the other mat-  
11 ters you raise in your submission and you can present it  
12 in whatever way you wish.

13 MR. FIFER: I have not prepared anything  
14 further in a written way, other than what I presented to  
15 you in letters. I have your letters in reply to these  
16 letters and I understood, or thought I understood, from  
17 the very beginning, from the published notice in the  
18 paper that you had been appointed to conduct a hearing. I  
19 thought I understood your limitations and it has been sub-  
20 stantiated by your letters. I think I understand your  
21 position clearly, however I am of the opinion that in-  
22 dividuals encounter these difficulties that groups do not,  
23 and I have been progressing this claim for seven years. I  
24 contend that according to the compensation laws I am  
25 entitled to compensation. My claim was placed with the  
26 Compensation Board by the Claims Department of the Rail-  
27 way, with their Headquarters in Winnipeg, and they sent  
28 an investigator down to Fort William and investigated the  
29 claim thoroughly, while I was in the hospital.

30 I made a statement prior to that - no, it





Nethercut & Young

2653

Toronto, Ontario

1 was after I got out of hospital -- that the investigator  
2 came down, but I was hospitalized for what the doctor  
3 termed a torn ligament of the heart. That has carried  
4 through in all my statements. However, the Compensation  
5 Board when they sent me a form to fill in, I included  
6 that, the same as I had to the local representative, that  
7 is the official -- the man in the official capacity --  
8 under which I worked in Port Arthur terminal, and to the  
9 investigator, and that is how the claim originated.

10 Well, the Compensation Board promptly noti-  
11 fied me that the claim had been rejected and following  
12 that I appealed it, and in a following letter they stated  
13 I was not a torn ligament of the heart as I had stated.  
14 I wrote to them and asked them to tell me what it was,  
15 but they would ignore all my questions, and I eventually  
16 learned that the doctor that attended me in the hospital  
17 -- in fact I went to him and he said he used scientific  
18 medical terms in his report which he sent to the Compen-  
19 sation Board, but he wouldn't tell me what it was.

20 From a Mr. Cross, Solicitor out of the  
21 Board's office, a couple of years ago he told me he had  
22 reported myocardial infarction. I had never heard of it  
23 before. However, the dictionaries have a definition for  
24 it, the college dictionaries as well as medical diction-  
25aries. I have consulted the data in the library, even to  
26 the extent of getting a copy and reading the Compensation  
27 Act from beginning to end, and I believe I can understand  
28 what I read.

29 Now the Compensation Board continually and  
30 persistently maintained that my accident, as it is called,





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2654

1 was not a result of or in any way related to my occupa-  
2 tional employment, but I know that is where it occurred.  
3 In checking the Compensation Act, there is a clause in  
4 there, Chapter 437, I believe, which states and I cannot  
5 quote it --

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Here is a copy if you  
7 want it.

8 MR. PIFER: I will read it again. I had  
9 copied it but I will look at 437. It is listed under  
10 Presumptions. Perhaps you can read it, this Chapter 437,  
11 as I don't know where to find it in here.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: As to accidents?

13 MR. PIFER: It is listed under "Presumptions"  
14 and it says where the accident arose out of the employ-  
15 ment, unless the contrary is shown, it shall be presumed  
16 that it occurred in the course of the employment, and  
17 where the accident occurred in the course of employment,  
18 unless the contrary is shown, it shall be presumed it  
19 arose out of the employment.

20 Now I know it occurred in the employment.  
21 They have stated that it hasn't been shown by me that it  
22 occurred there, and when I found that written in the Act,  
23 I discovered it placed the onus on the Compensation Board  
24 to show that it hadn't, or it would be presumed that it  
25 did. That places them in the same position. I know it  
26 occurred there and I have asked them to tell me where it  
27 was and where it did occur. They didn't question my  
28 permanent disability and I have been pressing for a Com-  
29 mission of the Provincial Government through the Premier's  
30 office, and written to his members for the last several





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2655

1 years to appoint a Commission to investigate my claim,  
2 and that is the only one I am familiar with, but from  
3 general reports I know of others where there has been  
4 general dissatisfaction. But it would appear, and it is  
5 practically established, that in fact in one of my letters  
6 to the Compensation Board I stated I was insured under  
7 the Compensation Act, and the reply to that was that not  
8 one cent was paid by the workmen, and it would appear  
9 that that is right as far as the railway worker is con-  
10 cerned, and I will use the word "it appears" that the  
11 payroll of the railway worker is not being taxed, and  
12 that is where the difficulty has been with railroad wor-  
13 kers in general. Unless they are bedridden, or have an  
14 external injury which is visible, it is hard to establish  
15 an internal injury and my injury is internal. I am  
16 handicapped by a shortness of breath and it would appear  
17 that our difficulty lies in the fact that we, as railway  
18 workers, have to meet the Medical Board of the Railway  
19 twice. Once, separate and apart from the Medical Depart-  
20 ment of the Compensation Board and then with them sitting  
21 in, and they have the Regional Chief Medical Officer of  
22 the Western Region, from Winnipeg, who has sat in at two  
23 meetings I have attended and he has helped.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Pifer, following  
25 your letter I asked for a report because I consider this  
26 a very serious allegation. I asked for a report from the  
27 Workmen's Compensation Board and that report states what  
28 happened there. The doctor was paid by the industry and,  
29 of course, just as you have a right to appeal, the industry  
30 has a right to appeal, and you have a right to bring what





Nethercut & Young

2656

Toronto, Ontario

1 evidence you choose upon appeal, and so has industry; and  
2 I am assured in that particular instance that doctor was  
3 brought there to represent the industry or to give evi-  
4 dence for the industry on this matter, but he did not sit  
5 as one of the appeal board and no outsider has ever sat  
6 on an appeal board but you make the statement again.  
7 This is the information I have and they gave me the spe-  
8 cific details of that appeal.

9 MR. PIFER: Entirely?

10 THE COMMISSIONER: I quoted to you what  
11 they said.

12 MR. PIFER: That is right, but instead of  
13 the Chief Medical Officer their reply to you was that I  
14 had stated the Chief Claims Officer, and there is where  
15 the difference lies. In my letter to you I referred to  
16 the trickiness that they resort to and employ and in  
17 that --

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Johnson would you  
19 mind getting me that from my file of submissions and  
20 my reply?

21 MR. PIFER: I have them in my file, I have  
22 a complete file here.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: This is a very serious  
24 allegation which you have made, Mr. Pifer, that some  
25 outsider sat on an appeal board, and not only an outsider  
26 but a representative of the industry in which you worked.  
27 On these appeals, did the union represent you on them?

28 MR. PIFER: They claimed that they were  
29 blocked, and the laws were such that they could not pro-  
30 gress a claim whatever the Compensation Board said was law.





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2657

1 and they are more interested -- and this is a hard state  
2 ment to make -- but with the things that I have encoun-  
3 tered they are not very interested in an individual mem-  
4 ber, and I am an individual member. You said it is a  
5 serious allegation and that is where I qualified it using  
6 the word just earlier, "it appeared" that the payroll of  
7 the railway worker is not being taxed and they are in  
8 reality dictating the terms to the Compensation Board,  
9 and that is why we cannot get anywhere.

10 MR. ESTEY: What union do you belong to?

11 MR. PIFER: The Brotherhood of Railway  
12 Trainmen.

13 MR. ESTEY: They wouldn't take up your  
14 appeal?

15 MR. PIFER: I went so far as the Vice-  
16 President, Gordon Gale, in Winnipeg, to the Legislative  
17 Representative, Gordon McGregor and he said he would take  
18 it up to the lodge, and I gave my submission to the local  
19 legislative representative and he said, "give me the  
20 material," and after awhile he brought it back to me and  
21 he said he couldn't do anything with it.

22 MR. ESTEY: So you had the appeal before  
23 the review board, and then the Board itself. You went  
24 right to the top didn't you? You had to do this all by  
25 yourself, you never got help from the union?

26 MR. PIFER: That is right. I have discussed  
27 this question with individual lawyers who say they act  
28 with the Board but not in the courts. Not a case in the  
29 courts.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: That is true, there is





1 no appeal to the courts.

2 MR. PIFER: But the Compensation Act states  
3 that the Board is appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor,  
4 I believe, of the Province, given quasi-judicial powers  
5 to administer the Act, but subject to approval; and I  
6 contend they have been administering -- misadministering  
7 -- the Act, and they have not the approval of the  
8 Lieutenant-Governor who, as I understand it, is appointed  
9 by the Government of Ontario, and that is why I appealed  
10 to Premier Robarts and members of his cabinet. I have  
11 been pressing for about three years for the opportunity  
12 of getting a judicial decision for my claim, and I feel  
13 that the only way the individual will get to the bottom  
14 of it is to make a test case out of some individual's  
15 claim, or mine.

16 I would like to appear and I have appeared  
17 before them, and when they state that the Medical Officer  
18 of the Railway from Winnipeg, appeared only as a repre-  
19 sentative at their meeting, in their offices here on the  
20 19th of November last year, he sat in and they had a  
21 court reporter present, and if he reported everything  
22 that occurred it will show Dr. Dwyer, from Winnipeg, very  
23 active and trying to put me through a sweat session.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: This Dr. Dwyer you refer  
25 to, and while you say it is true, they say he didn't. The  
26 Regional Chief Claims Officer of the C.N.R. was present.  
27 I don't know whether he is that or not, but he was advised  
28 on November 19th, 1965, and Dr. Dwyer attended as a  
29 representative of the Canadian National Railways, at which  
30 hearing he appeared as a representative of the employer





Nethercut & Young

2659

Toronto, Ontario

1 who certainly was not a sitting member.

2 MR. PIFER: There is no question that he  
3 was.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: The C.N.R., as your  
5 employer as I already have explained, has a right to be  
6 there when you make a claim and oppose it as they see  
7 fit, and that is apparently what they did. He wasn't  
8 sitting as a member of the Board, he was sitting to argue  
9 against your claim apparently.

10 MR. PIFER: I have asked for a copy of the  
11 court reporter's report to be made available to me and  
12 to members of the Provincial cabinet, and they will not  
13 ignore it. Mr. Legge, who has replaced, I believe, Mr.  
14 Sparrow as Chairman of the Board, would not appear at  
15 that meeting last November 19th, and I came to Toronto  
16 particularly to see him. At a later time I phoned the  
17 office and I was referred to an assistant. I phoned the  
18 office and after waiting awhile received a notice, I  
19 believe from his executive assistant, that he was un-  
20 available and they won't meet me face to face, any of  
21 them, and why I don't know.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: You appeared on an  
23 appeal before the Board. There must be some finality.

24 MR. PIFER: That is what I am looking for,  
25 the finality. This has been a very expensive operation  
26 for me. I am one who will not surrender to the scheme of  
27 divide and conquer they have been playing for years. I  
28 am looking for a finality and when it comes, and I think  
29 in my letter I stated that I hoped it would reach the  
30 stage whereby you would be granted the privilege of





Nethercut & Young

2660

Toronto, Ontario

1 making a decision, and whatever your decision is, or  
2 whoever has the authority to make a verdict, I will have  
3 to accede to it whether I like it or not. That will be  
4 finality. At least I would be relieved of the expense.  
5 I haven't a cent out of them yet and I am entitled to  
6 the maximum compensation.

7 MR. ESTEY: One question you might discuss  
8 with the Royal Commission. After you made your claim and  
9 were first rejected, do you remember being attended by a  
10 Dr. Jamieson?

11 MR. PIFER: No.

12 MR. ESTEY: You can't remember that? Do  
13 you remember being asked by the Board to nominate a  
14 doctor to examine you as a medical referee?

15 MR. PIFER: To choose one out of three, I  
16 remember that.

17 MR. ESTEY: Which one did you choose?

18 MR. PIFER: I wouldn't accept anyone at the  
19 start because I contended at the start they were elevat-  
20 ing a doctor to the role of a judge, and a year later I  
21 decided to take a chance on the doctor in the role of the  
22 judge.

23 MR. ESTEY: Which one?

24 MR. PIFER: Dr. Greenwood.

25 MR. ESTEY: Do you know what his opinion  
26 was?

27 MR. PIFER: No, they wouldn't tell me. They  
28 maintained they have privileged evidence which can't be  
29 released to anyone concerned in the claim.

30 MR. ESTEY: After Dr. Greenwood examined





Nethercut & Young

2661

Toronto, Ontario

1 you, you had your appeal before the Appeal Tribunal in  
2 Port Arthur?

3 MR. PIFER: That is right.

4 MR. ESTEY: I take it Dr. Greenwood did not  
5 appear at that time?

6 MR. PIFER: No, he did not.

7 MR. ESTEY: And you didn't know what was in  
8 the report of Dr. Greenwood at that time?

9 MR. PIFER: I did not know and I wasn't too  
10 much concerned what was in his report, but I accepted him  
11 as a referee. He was acting in the role of a judge and  
12 when I later read -- sir, may I ask this man's position?

13 THE COMMISSIONER: This is Mr. Estey and he  
14 is the Commission Counsel and he is here to assist me,  
15 and he apparently has more information about the claim  
16 than I have, and you should accept the questions from  
17 him. You are quite justified in asking what his position  
18 is if you did not know.

19 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Pifer, I am just trying to  
20 get the history in the order of the events. You are an  
21 expert on your history, it is well known to you, but not  
22 to us and I want to go through a step at a time. When  
23 you nominated Dr. Greenwood --

24 THE COMMISSIONER: If it would make you  
25 happier you can sit down, if your breathing is difficult.

26 MR. PIFER: It is easier sitting down, but  
27 I would like to show you a copy of a letter from Dr.  
28 Greenwood afterwards.

29 MR. ESTEY: You were going to find a letter  
30 from Dr. Greenwood?





Nethercut & Young

2662

Toronto, Ontario

1                           MR. PIFER: That is right, and I have it  
2 right here, dated September 13th, 1961. It reads, "I  
3 received your letter of the 21st of June and answered it,  
4 and I believe it may have gone but there is no carbon  
5 copy in my file. My instructions from the Workmen's  
6 Compensation Board were that I was to furnish a report  
7 your examination to the Board and to none else. Thus  
8 my report is the property of the Workmen's Compensation  
9 Board. If they wish to supply you with a copy, they wi  
10 I am unable to do so."

11                          Now Dr. Greenwood was represented to me  
12 being an independent doctor, and in his letter it estab-  
13 lishes that he is not an independent doctor.

14                          THE COMMISSIONER: When you went on to  
15 appeal did the Board furnish you -- if they didn't furnish  
16 you with his report, did they furnish you with a sum-  
17 of his report?

18                          MR. PIFER: No they wouldn't furnish me  
19 with anything.

20                          THE COMMISSIONER: You got no summary of  
21 the medical evidence at all?

22                          MR. PIFER: No, they maintained they had in  
23 their file what they called "privileged" evidence that  
24 could not be released to anyone, and they have been  
25 operating a secret organization for years with everybody  
26 else and with me, and I don't have anything directly from  
27 Dr. Greenwood.

28                          MR. ESTEY: In the next paragraph, you  
29 refer to Dr. Cain, who is Dr. Cain?

30                          MR. PIFER: Dr. Cain is a doctor out of the





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2663

1 Clinic in Fort William.

2 MR. ESTEY: Did you go to see him?

3 MR. PIFER: I went to see him.

4 MR. ESTEY: After your examination with  
5 Dr. Greenwood was completed?

6 MR. PIFER: On that Dr. Cain, I have a  
7 letter from Dr. Cain similar --

8 MR. ESTEY: You saw Dr. Cain after you saw  
9 Dr. Greenwood?

10 MR. PIFER: Oh, yes.

11 MR. ESTEY: And Dr. Cain also said he  
12 couldn't give you a report?

13 MR. PIFER: That is right.

14 MR. ESTEY: Since that time you have not  
15 received either of those reports?

16 MR. PIFER: No.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: By the way, this was in  
18 1959 you appeared before the Board?

19 MR. PIFER: No, not before the Board.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: You say 'originating'.

21 MR. PIFER: That is the day I was placed in  
22 the hospital for a torn ligament of the heart.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Then you went before a  
24 review committee, did you, and then appealed right to the  
25 Board. Is that what you did?

26 MR. PIFER: Well, I had two more years to  
27 work before I reached normal retirement, and I was wanting  
28 to carry on in the condition I was in for the two years  
29 and earn what I could, as well as increasing my pension.  
30 I qualified with the Medical Board in Winnipeg under





Nethercut & Young

2664

Toronto, Ontario

1 Dr. Dwyer, although I was always shooed away from him to  
2 some of his assistants. He would never see me in Winni-  
3 peg and I tried to see him on several occasions, but I  
4 tried to go back to work when the Compensation Board  
5 notified me, in their first letter, a copy of which was  
6 going to my employer, and then the Medical Board of the  
7 Railway started to put the pressure on me to apply for  
8 retirement.

9 MR. ESTEY: These dates now, speaking for  
10 myself, are very confusing. Would you go through the  
11 dates now with me and tell me whether I am right?

12 MR. PIFER: All right, sir.

13 MR. ESTEY: Your illness started in August,  
14 1959, is that right?

15 MR. PIFER: August 17th.

16 MR. ESTEY: After that your claim was re-  
17 jected by the first letter from the Board, and they noti-  
18 fied you your claim was not going to be recognized for  
19 compensation, do you remember that?

20 MR. PIFER: That is right.

21 MR. ESTEY: After that you went to the  
22 Board and the Board and you engaged in some correspondence  
23 about the medical referee business, do you remember that?

24 MR. PIFER: I believe I do.

25 MR. ESTEY: Then you took the position that  
26 the medical referee was not to make a decision which the  
27 Board ought to make, and you objected to this, but ulti-  
28 mately agreed on Dr. Greenwood would be the medical ex-  
29 pert to examine you?

30 MR. PIFER: To examine me and make a





Nethercut & Young

2665

Toronto, Ontario

1 decision.

2 MR. ESTEY: He rendered his verdict and you  
3 never got a copy of it?

4 MR. PIFER: No.

5 MR. ESTEY: And after that you appealed  
6 your decision to the Appeal Tribunal and that Tribunal  
7 sat in Port Arthur, you told me?

8 MR. PIFER: That is right.

9 MR. ESTEY: It sat in April, 1965, would  
10 that sound about right?

11 MR. PIFER: That sounds about right. May  
12 I clarify that to a degree, and I use the word 'clarify'  
13 probably incorrectly, but that Board sitting in Port  
14 Arthur was the result of my appeal to the Provincial  
15 Government, the Premier in his offices, and their con-  
16 tact with Dr. Reynolds, his executive assistant, was in-  
17 strumental in having that Board set up.

18 MR. ESTEY: We can go back to that if you  
19 like, but I want to follow the dates to figure it out.  
20 In the Appeal Tribunal sitting in Port Arthur, did you  
21 have anybody with you helping you as counsel or adviser?

22 MR. PIFER: I haven't at any time.

23 MR. ESTEY: Perhaps you will help me, say  
24 anything you want, but it would be more helpful just to  
25 answer the questions. Did anybody ever say you were  
26 entitled to have a workmen's adviser sit with you?

27 MR. PIFER: The Board notified me that I  
28 could have counsel and professional assistance. I believe  
29 they used the word professional evidence, but all at my  
30 expense.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2666

1 MR. ESTEY: Yes?

2 MR. PIFER: And that is the way they wear  
3 you out, financially and physically.

4 MR. ESTEY: When you got to the Appeal  
5 Tribunal, were you given any copies of the letters and  
6 doctor's reports before that Board sat?

7 MR. PIFER: No.

8 MR. ESTEY: When the Board sat, can you  
9 remember what happened? How did it go?

10 MR. PIFER: Well, they attempted to make it  
11 appear -- pardon me -- they used the Bible to start with  
12 to put me under oath, or attempted to -- well they did.  
13 I told them I told the truth but to make it appear I was  
14 faced with court proceedings, they told me I was under  
15 oath in everything I said and that if I did not stick to  
16 the truth --

17 MR. ESTEY: You would be in trouble?

18 MR. PIFER: I would be in trouble.

19 MR. ESTEY: Dr. Greenwood did not appear?

20 MR. PIFER: No.

21 MR. ESTEY: Dr. Greenwood did not appear?

22 MR. PIFER: No.

23 MR. ESTEY: Did any doctors give evidence  
24 at that hearing?

25 MR. PIFER: No.

26 MR. ESTEY: Did anybody other than you give  
27 evidence at that hearing?

28 MR. PIFER: No.

29 MR. ESTEY: Did the Board have somebody  
30 that got up and read to the Board the reports which had





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2667

1 been in the Board's files prior to that time?

2 MR. PIFER: From doctors?

3 MR. ESTEY: Yes.

4 MR. PIFER: No.

5 MR. ESTEY: Well then, you stood up and  
6 told your story starting back with picking/<sup>up</sup> the four hun-  
7 dred and seventy-eight pound weight and so on, you told  
8 that to the Board?

9 MR. PIFER: In Port Arthur, yes. That  
10 weight was established by the investigator from the  
11 Claims Department in Winnipeg. In the official report I  
12 said three or four hundred pounds. I didn't know what  
13 it weighed.

14 MR. ESTEY: Other than yourself, there  
15 were no other witnesses in the tribunal?

16 MR. PIFER: That is right.

17 MR. ESTEY: At the end of the hearing did  
18 the Board say what the decision was?

19 MR. PIFER: No, not at that time.

20 MR. ESTEY: They said they would let you  
21 know?

22 MR. PIFER: That is right.

23 MR. ESTEY: And after they rejected your  
24 claim, did you get a notice you could appeal it to the  
25 full Board of the Workmen's Compensation in Toronto?

26 MR. PIFER: Not for awhile.

27 MR. ESTEY: Eventually did you get such a  
28 notice.

29 MR. PIFER: Yes, I got a notice that the  
30 Board would sit and I could appear.





Nethercut & Young

2668

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. ESTEY: You came down to that?

2 MR. PIFER: Yes, sir, right.

3 MR. ESTEY: When you appeared, how many  
4 members were present?

5 MR. PIFER: Two.

6 MR. ESTEY: And again I take it you had no  
7 advisory counsel or lawyer?

8 MR. PIFER: That is right. May I inter-  
9 ject? I was advised that I could have these things but  
10 it would be at my expense.

11 MR. ESTEY: That was the same situation as  
12 at the Appeal Tribunal?

13 MR. PIFER: That is right.

14 MR. ESTEY: So you came alone. Would you  
15 tell us at that time did you give your evidence again  
16 starting back at the time of the illness and accident?

17 MR. PIFER: Yes.

18 MR. ESTEY: You told the whole story again?

19 MR. PIFER: That is right.

20 MR. ESTEY: And again you were the only  
21 witness that appeared?

22 MR. PIFER: That is right.

23 MR. ESTEY: Did the Board give you a copy  
24 of the transcription of the Port Arthur hearing?

25 MR. PIFER: No.

26 MR. ESTEY: Were you given a summary of the  
27 doctor's evidence, or what was in the file on medical  
28 evidence?

29 MR. PIFER: No.

30 MR. ESTEY: Were you told you could have





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2660

1 such a summary?

2 MR. PIFER: I was told I couldn't have  
3 one, that it was privileged evidence, and that couldn't  
4 go out.

5 MR. ESTEY: You read those letters to us,  
6 I wonder about a summary?

7 MR. PIFER: No, I haven't had a summary.

8 MR. ESTEY: They didn't say you could or  
9 could not, but you haven't been given one?

10 MR. PIFER: That is right. May I inter-  
11 ject? This is a report, this answers your question a  
12 little better. I wrote and asked for a copy of Dr.  
13 Greenwood's report and they wouldn't give it to me.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: That wasn't his ques-  
15 tion. The Board has consistently refused to produce the  
16 report and that is one of the things we have to consider  
17 here, which you are raising. Now the Board has told us  
18 they produce for appeals summaries of the evidence, and  
19 they give appellants a full summary of the evidence with-  
20 out disclosing individual statements of doctors who ex-  
21 amine the patients.

22 MR. PIFER: That is not correct.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: You never received one?

24 MR. PIFER: I never received one.

25 MR. ESTEY: At the hearing before the  
26 Board, was the Canadian National Railways present through  
27 some representative, Dr. Dwyer, was he there?

28 MR. PIFER: In Port Arthur?

29 MR. ESTEY: All right, in Port Arthur?

30 MR. PIFER: Yes, he was there.





Nethercut & Young

2670

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. ESTEY: Did he have much to say at  
2 that time?

3 MR. PIFER: Nothing.

4 MR. ESTEY: In Toronto, did he appear be-  
5 fore the Board?

6 MR. PIFER: Yes, that is where he became  
7 active, here in Toronto.

8 MR. ESTEY: He had something to say here  
9 in Toronto?

10 MR. PIFER: Yes, he did.

11 MR. ESTEY: What generally did he have to  
12 say, do you remember?

13 MR. PIFER: He was attempting to enter  
14 evidence which was not correct.

15 MR. ESTEY: Did the Board let him?

16 MR. PIFER: No, I stopped him. They would  
17 let him go alright. I stopped him and soon as I object-  
18 ed and ducked into my files they dropped the question  
19 right away.

20 MR. ESTEY: We are interested in this one  
21 part of it, as to procedure. Perhaps you can help us.  
22 When Dr. Dwyer appeared at the Board here in Toronto,  
23 was he a witness or a representative of the Railway?

24 MR. PIFER: I didn't know he was going to  
25 be there until I got here. I was surprised to see him  
26 in Port Arthur in the first place. He was always too  
27 busy to see me in his own offices in Winnipeg but came  
28 to Port Arthur in a special car and he just sat there.  
29 It is the first time I ever seen him.

30 MR. ESTEY: Down in Toronto, tell us about





Nethercut & Young

2671

Toronto, Ontario

1 that.

2 MR. PIFER: In Toronto he came in while I  
3 was in the waiting room. He came to the waiting room  
4 where I had taken off my coat and he entered inside, and  
5 after awhile I was entered and he was sitting at the  
6 table along with these other men, and again they started  
7 in by using the Bible.

8 MR. ESTEY: Did they use the Bible for  
9 the doctor as well as you?

10 MR. PIFER: No, just for me because they  
11 had me all by themselves.

12 MR. ESTEY: You were a better prospect?

13 MR. PIFER: Oh yes, I am the dumb one of  
14 the crowd.

15 MR. ESTEY: Let us get back to the pro-  
16 cedure. When you got in the room the two Board members  
17 sat at one end, and you sat at the other?

18 MR. PIFER: I sat, shall we say, I sat  
19 facing them. Dr. Dwyer sat, I guess parallel to me, a  
20 little further to the right facing them as well, but he  
21 had his evidence there and attempted to show them some  
22 of the things that occurred in Winnipeg at their Board.

23 MR. ESTEY: What do you mean, Winnipeg at  
24 their Board?

25 MR. PIFER: Well, I have a file a mile  
26 thick at the Canadian National Medical Board.

27 MR. ESTEY: Did you go to Winnipeg to be  
28 examined by that Board?

29 MR. PIFER: I had to. We are subject to  
30 periodical medical examinations by the Railway, and the





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

26 72

1 Medical Board, and if there is something that displeases  
2 them, they will find a pimple on you some place or  
3 another, and reject you for further employment.

4 MR. ESTEY: But this was after your heart  
5 attack that you went to Winnipeg?

6 MR. PIFER: It has been called a heart  
7 attack.

8 MR. ESTEY: I am sorry I used the term.

9 After the 19th of August 1959, did you go to the Medical  
10 Board in Winnipeg?

11 MR. PIFER: After I was rejected?

12 MR. ESTEY: By the Workmen's Compensation  
13 Board?

14 MR. PIFER: Yes, and appeared before one  
15 of their doctors they appointed in Port Arthur. And may  
16 I add to that after he examined me he said, "you appear  
17 to be in fairly good physical shape, what is this all  
18 about?"

19 MR. ESTEY: The Winnipeg doctor?

20 MR. PIFER: The Port Arthur doctor, Dr.  
21 Ritchies.

22 MR. ESTEY: This was after the claim had  
23 arisen?

24 MR. PIFER: That is right.

25 MR. ESTEY: Why did they take you to  
26 Winnipeg to be examined?

27 MR. PIFER: I went to Winnipeg and asked  
28 for an examination right in their office when I wasn't  
29 acceptable to return to work. I got it and qualified to  
30 return to work with that examination.





Nethercut & Young

2673

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. ESTEY: And did you return to work?

2 MR. PIFER: No. They wouldn't let me  
3 after the Compensation Board turned my claim down.

4 MR. ESTEY: We have this situation. The  
5 Canadian National Regional Board said you were fit to  
6 return to work, but after that report and before you  
7 returned to work the Compensation Board denied your  
8 claim?

9 MR. PIFER: Will you repeat that?

10 MR. ESTEY: Your claim arose in August,  
11 1959, and after that you were examined by Dr. Ritchies  
12 at the Lakehead, and then examined in Winnipeg by the  
13 Regional Board of the Canadian National Railways, with  
14 a view to saying whether you were fit to go back to work  
15 and that Board decided you were fit to go back to work  
16 but before the Canadian National Railways put you back  
17 on the job, the Compensation Board turned down your claim  
18 for compensation. Is that right?

19 MR. PIFER: I just don't quite get that.  
20 I don't want to make a statement that is not correct.  
21 The Compensation Board turned it down before that.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Let us stop now. I am  
23 confused. Did somebody tell you you couldn't go back  
24 to work?

25 MR. PIFER: They extended the sick leave  
26 to six months. The doctor who placed me in the hospital  
27 for torn ligament of the heart okayed me to return to  
28 work after two months for doing curtailed work.

29 MR. ESTEY: Did you return to work?

30 MR. PIFER: No.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2674

- 1 MR. ESTEY: Why didn't you?
- 2 MR. PIFER: I was notified I had to appear
- 3 before Dr. Ritchies, representing the Railway in Port
- 4 Arthur, and he made the statement that I would seem to
- 5 be in pretty good shape and he said, "what is this all
- 6 about?" I told him what I was hospitalized for and he
- 7 said he would have to send his report in to Winnipeg. He
- 8 wanted a report from the doctor who attended me in the
- 9 hospital before he went back, and when I still didn't
- 10 get anywhere, I went back to him to find out if he had
- 11 been a party to having the Compensation Board reject me.
- 12 MR. ESTEY: Did you try to go back to work?
- 13 MR. PIFER: Yes. I had to leave home to
- 14 return to work and I was in the act of getting the best
- 15 job I could get with my seniority.
- 16 THE COMMISSIONER: Could you return to
- 17 work with the Canadian National Railway?
- 18 MR. PIFER: In baggage service on other
- 19 trains where there were two brakemen employed.
- 20 THE COMMISSIONER: They were prepared to
- 21 take you back, but not in the same place as you were
- 22 before?
- 23 MR. PIFER: That is right.
- 24 THE COMMISSIONER: What did you do before?
- 25 MR. PIFER: I was a combination baggage
- 26 man, express messenger and mail clerk, handling a job
- 27 connected with three men half way between there and
- 28 Winnipeg. It had formerly been two men and in the days
- 29 of the depression they made it a one man job, and when
- 30 business got stronger again they had me on there and





Nethercut & Young

2675

Toronto, Ontario

1 there was every effort made to have more help on that  
2 train. The Express Department wouldn't stand for it. I  
3 got twenty dollars and sixty-seven cents for express  
4 messenger work, in addition to baggageman's pay and  
5 twelve dollars a month for handling the Royal Mail. I  
6 worked from there to Fort Frances and at Fort Frances  
7 they had three different cars, three different men, a  
8 baggage car, express car and a mail car. I grant you it  
9 was a little heavier between there and Winnipeg, but I  
10 had reports to prepare for all of them and I was a busy  
11 little boy.

12 MR. ESTEY: I want to finish off with what  
13 happened down in Toronto. You got as far as the waiting  
14 room. The doctor went in and you went in afterwards.  
15 How long afterwards?

16 MR. PIFER: Roughly ten or fifteen minutes.

17 MR. ESTEY: I see. When you got in there  
18 they were waiting to start your case?

19 MR. PIFER: That is right.

20 MR. ESTEY: How long did your case take?

21 MR. PIFER: Approximately one hour.

22 MR. ESTEY: And during that time you again  
23 were the only witness?

24 MR. PIFER: That is right.

25 MR. ESTEY: Did the Board have a lawyer  
26 there asking you questions?

27 MR. PIFER: No they did not. May I say  
28 at their appeal you have raised an opportunity for me to  
29 make this statement. At the Appeal Tribunal in Port  
30 Arthur when I contested and questioned some of their





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2676

1 statements and asked questions of my own, the reply I  
2 received was they weren't there to answer questions,  
3 they were there to ask them.

4 MR. ESTEY: Did you notice in that appeal  
5 here, or the Appeal Tribunal, did anybody ever dispute  
6 the fact you picked up the four hundred and seventy-  
7 eight pound weight?

8 MR. PIFER: No, it was never disputed.

9 MR. ESTEY: Was it ever disputed that you  
10 did that as part of your job?

11 MR. PIFER: No.

12 MR. ESTEY: I take it you did it as part  
13 of your work?

14 MR. PIFER: Oh, yes. In the Express De-  
15 partment.

16 MR. ESTEY: The medical evidence was not  
17 read out loud in Toronto at the Board Hearing?

18 MR. PIFER: No.

19 MR. ESTEY: Do you know if there was a  
20 pause in the proceedings while the Board read the medical  
21 evidence out of any files?

22 MR. PIFER: Not to my recollection.

23 MR. ESTEY: Was the whole of the one hour  
24 taken by you explaining your position?

25 MR. PIFER: I would say yes.

26 MR. ESTEY: And then you got into a dis-  
27 cussion with Dr. Dwyer and he wanted to say something,  
28 and eventually you arranged to have your objection sus-  
29 tained, and he was stopped?

30 MR. PIFER: He just stopped because I had





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2677

1 him stopped. I had my records to establish what he said  
2 wasn't correct.

3 MR. ESTEY: So the Board heard the rest of  
4 your story and they told you they would give you their  
5 decision shortly, is that right?

6 MR. PIFER: They said it would be at least  
7 a week before rendering a decision.

8 MR. ESTEY: Eventually you did hear from  
9 them?

10 MR. PIFER: That is right.

11 MR. ESTEY: By letter?

12 MR. PIFER: Yes.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: And the letter said  
14 your claim was rejected and no reasons were given?

15 MR. PIFER: I would say no reasons. I  
16 have their letter in the file some place.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Could you find that  
18 without too much trouble?

19 MR. PIFER: Here is what I received from  
20 the Board.

21 MR. ESTEY: You have given us, Mr. Pifer,  
22 a letter to you in Fort William, from the Board. Or at  
23 least on their letterhead, signed by R.E. Simpson. It  
24 reads:

25 "Following your hearing before the Board  
26 on November 19th, 1965, enclosed is a copy  
27 of the Board's decision."

28 Attached to that is a document headed  
29 "Workmen's Compensation Board" which stated you appeared  
30 on your own behalf and Dr. Dwyer, Medical Officer, for





Nethercut & Young

2670

Toronto, Ontario

1       the Canadian National Railways who appeared for the  
2       Railway, and under the heading "Decision" it goes on to  
3       state it is an appeal from the decision of the Appeal  
4       Tribunal dated April 21st, 1965, in the case of Mr.  
5       Conwell Pifer whose claim is for compensation and medical  
6       aid expenses, as a result of a cardiac attack when in the  
7       employ of Canadian National Railways. It goes on to  
8       state "The Board has carefully reviewed the evidence of  
9       the Appeal Tribunal here and has been assisted by Mr.  
10      Pifer's evidence before the Board. The Board has found  
11      at the time of Mr. Pifer's disability, the cardiac dis-  
12      ability is not compensable." This is dated December  
13      15th, 1965 and signed E.C. Steele, M.D., and J.A. Colley,  
14      Vice-President.

15                   I take it the third member, Mr. Legge, was  
16      not present?

17                   MR. PIFER: That is right. And may I add  
18      to that, later on I phoned his office and he wouldn't  
19      answer his phone.

20                   MR. ESTEY: Were you given any reasons at  
21      the Appeal Tribunal level at Port Arthur as to why your  
22      claim was denied?

23                   MR. PIFER: Other than they persistently  
24      avoided the diagnosis that I was hospitalized under a  
25      torn ligament of the heart. I have asked them to tell  
26      me if it wasn't a torn ligament what was it, and they  
27      persistently evade that question and they have called it  
28      a coronary, and I believe they furnished Mr. Justice  
29      McGillivray -- I have it in the other file -- a copy of  
30      their letter to me stating that the Appeal Tribunal in





Nethercut & Young

2679

Toronto, Ontario

1 Port Arthur accepted the diagnosis on August 17th, 1959,  
2 as coronary thrombosis, and there never was any throm-  
3 bosis. Not yet anyway.

4 MR. ESTEY: Have you a letter to that  
5 effect? I just wondered if you had that in a letter?

6 MR. PIFER: I received that letter from  
7 Mr. Justice McGillivray, a copy of it.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: The only thing I sent  
9 you is the extract I referred to you was it not? I  
10 didn't send you a copy of a letter. If so, it went out  
11 by mistake.

12 MR. PIFER: It could have been a mistake.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: I returned to you the  
14 material you sent to me.

15 MR. PIFER: You returned this to me, but  
16 I have that original letter. That was enclosing your  
17 letter to me.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: This is a letter addres-  
19 sed to you by the Secretary of the Field Tribunal?

20 MR. PIFER: That is right. I have the  
21 original of that letter, did they furnish you a copy?

22 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Pifer, could I file as an  
23 exhibit a letter you gave me a moment ago from the Board?

24 MR. PIFER: I wish you would take them all  
25 and file them all as exhibits.

26 MR. ESTEY: If we may have it, could Mr.  
27 Johnson give that a file number?

28 MR. JOHNSON: It will be Exhibit No. 44.

29 EXHIBIT "44": Letter dated May 7th, 1965,  
30 filed.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2680

1 MR. ESTEY: This is a report and is dated  
2 May 7th. Mr. Pifer, you gave us a letter dated the 7th  
3 May, 1965, directed to you by the Secretary of the  
4 Field Tribunal, in which they say in part you had pain  
5 in your left arm prior to August 17th, 1959. Did you  
6 give the Board that information?

7 MR. PIFER: Yes, but I didn't until later  
8 on. I had been working and treated it as a strain to  
9 the left shoulder and shoulder blade, and I never knew  
10 the heart was involved. I was favouring the left arm  
11 and taking the bulk of the work on my right arm and  
12 shouldn't have been doing it. It wasn't until I gave  
13 that heavy lift in August, 1959 --

14 MR. ESTEY: One other question. When you  
15 went to the doctor the first doctor, you went to see  
16 who, Dr. Ritchies?

17 MR. PIFER: No. The first doctor I went  
18 to was Dr. Craig, in Fort William.

19 MR. ESTEY: The C.N.R. doctor?

20 MR. PIFER: No, a private doctor. My own  
21 doctor. He referred me, he had only opened a new build-  
22 ing and taken a partner in, and he recommended Dr.  
23 Nickerson very highly, as being a specialist in internal  
24 medicine, and asking me to accept him. He was a spe-  
25 cialist in surgery himself.

26 MR. ESTEY: You went to Nickerson?

27 MR. PIFER: He just transferred me to him  
28 in that office. His partner.

29 MR. ESTEY: What doctor did you go to next?

30 MR. PIFER: The next was Dr. Ritchies,





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2681

1 under instructions from the C.N.R.

2 MR. ESTEY: That was to see if you were  
3 fit to go back to work?

4 MR. PIFER: That is right.

5 MR. ESTEY: After that you saw Dr. Green-  
6 wood?

7 MR. PIFER: After that I went directly to  
8 the Medical Clinic in Winnipeg.

9 MR. ESTEY: For the C.N.R. again?

10 MR. PIFER: The C.N.R. again.

11 MR. ESTEY: What doctor after that?

12 MR. PIFER: Dr. Greenwood.

13 MR. ESTEY: Then you went to Dr. Greenwood.  
14 Do you remember whether you signed any statement that  
15 you agreed that Dr. Greenwood would be a medical referee  
16 and his decision would be final and binding? Do you re-  
17 member that?

18 MR. PIFER: I remember -- in fact you are  
19 now raising a question that I can only answer by refer-  
20 ring you to my letter and the conditions under which I  
21 accepted Dr. Greenwood. I wouldn't accept him in the  
22 role of a judge in the first place, but I finally agreed  
23 as I wanted to finalize the claim some way or another.  
24 Then I had a submission to Dr. Greenwood -- that is it  
25 presented the case in its entirety and I think it was  
26 enclosed in material I left before this sitting started.

27 MR. ESTEY: Yes, I have looked at that.  
28 How did you happen to select Dr. Greenwood? Was he  
29 named to you in a list of three and you picked one?

30 MR. PIFER: That is right. He headed the





Nethercut & Young

2682

Toronto, Ontario

1 list and they were all the same to me.

2 MR. ESTEY: Where was he?

3 MR. PIFER: In Toronto.

4 MR. ESTEY: And you came to Toronto to be  
5 examined by him?

6 MR. PIFER: That is right. The Board  
7 agreed to pay my expenses and when I got home I sub-  
8 mitted a bill. I stayed in Toronto two nights and, by  
9 the way, at the King Edward Hotel, and paid my own  
10 sleeper back. I have a system pass on the railroad and  
11 I am not considering that in. I thought I kept my ex-  
12 pense account to a minimum and I sent a bill of forty-  
13 one dollars and thirty-five cents and some time later I  
14 got a letter. There was a check for twenty-seven dollars  
15 and forty cents enclosed. Nothing, no explanation at  
16 all and I wouldn't cash it, and I eventually returned it  
17 to them. I haven't had a cent from them. Right now it  
18 is costing me ten dollars a night. They wear you out  
19 financially.

20 MR. ESTEY: What about the medical bills,  
21 were they paid by the Board?

22 MR. PIFER: Not by the Board. I was a  
23 member of the medical insurance group of the trainmen's  
24 organization, as well as the hospital, and I still have  
25 that carried through the union.

26 MR. ESTEY: Then they paid the medical  
27 expenses?

28 MR. PIFER: They paid the medical expenses.  
29 May I just finish answering that former question. Some  
30 little return I had to make afterwards I paid individually,





Nethercut & Young

2683

Toronto, Ontario

1 such as blood tests and one thing or another, and once  
2 they get the type, this welfare organization, described  
3 I believe it was by the manufacturer's association as a  
4 welfare racket, and I know that some of these doctors are  
5 playing it for a racket whenever they get a chance.

6 MR. ESTEY: I don't want to tire you out.  
7 Just two more questions. Did you sign any kind of a  
8 statement saying you agreed that Dr. Greenwood's report  
9 would be final and binding?

10 MR. PIFER: A verdict, not his opinion,  
11 and I have my letter stating that an opinion and a ver-  
12 dict are two different things, as far as I was concerned.

13 MR. ESTEY: Am I right in assuming since  
14 August 17th, 1959, you have not worked for the C.N.R.?

15 MR. PIFER: That is right. I couldn't  
16 qualify to work any place.

17 MR. ESTEY: And you didn't, in fact, go to  
18 work for the C.N.R. after that?

19 MR. PIFER: Oh, no.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: I thought they asked you  
21 to go back to a junior job and you wouldn't take it?

22 MR. PIFER: Not a junior job. A little  
23 less strenuous. They permitted me to return to work and  
24 could exercise my seniority as a baggage man any place  
25 in the promotion district, which was between Port Arthur  
26 and Vancouver, if I had to.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Did you return then  
28 when they offered this?

29 MR. PIFER: I was in the act of returning  
30 and in the crew clerk's office in Winnipeg, and he was





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2684

1 giving the data from Edmonton or Vancouver where my  
2 seniority would entitle me to work. I could work out of  
3 Winnipeg or Edmonton but I preferred to go to Vancouver  
4 if I had to leave home, on account of the weather.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: What was the result of  
6 it?

7 MR. PIFER: Then they extended the sick  
8 leave and wrote to Port Arthur to convince me that it  
9 was in the best interests of all concerned for me to  
10 apply for pension.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: They originally sug-  
12 gested that you go back to this, but instead of going  
13 back when you were prepared to go back, they extended  
14 sick leave and suggested you go on pension?

15 MR. PIFER: They extended sick leave at  
16 six months, but prior to that they asked me to apply for  
17 a disability pension.

18 MR. ESTEY: When you say "they", you mean  
19 the Railway asked you to apply?

20 MR. PIFER: The Medical Board, not the  
21 Railway. The Railway Medical Board --

22 MR. ESTEY: It wasn't a disability pension,  
23 it was a pension you were due to get in two years time?

24 MR. PIFER: That is right.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Except it would be at  
26 a lower rate because it was two years ahead, is that  
27 right?

28 MR. PIFER: They didn't deduct from my  
29 allowable service. I was thirty-six years in the train  
30 service, although I only had twenty years and ten months





Nethercut & Young

2685

Toronto, Ontario

1 allowable service of that. If I had of applied for a  
2 pension, they would have deducted two years from that,  
3 which wouldn't make my allowable because you have to  
4 have at least twenty years.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: You didn't go on regular  
6 pension, you went on disability pension, is that  
7 what you say?

8 MR. PIFER. That is right.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: And it is less than the  
10 regular pension, is that right?

11 MR. PIFER: Yes, because I would have had  
12 two more years and a different rate of earnings to base  
13 my pension on.

14 MR. ESTEY: You are on that pension now?

15 MR. PIFER: Oh yes, I have been for awhile.  
16 I asked them for it when I decided that they were trying  
17 to wear me out one way or another, so I better keep a  
18 little something; so I applied for it and tried to get  
19 it retroactive to when I last worked. They wouldn't do  
20 it. They provided it to the first December. I lost a  
21 couple of months there.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: When you were on sick  
23 leave, didn't you get full pay?

24 MR. PIFER: No. I was supposed to get it  
25 under compensation but I haven't got anything. It hasn't  
26 taken effect yet, but there was in progress, in a state  
27 of progress at that time a welfare plan, whereby you  
28 get it, but it hadn't been put into effect yet, and I  
29 didn't get that. I didn't get anything but I did get my  
30 pension, and the gross pension is one hundred and three





Nethercut & Young

2686

Toronto, Ontario

1 dollars and four cents a month, and because I have been  
2 successful in having it carried through the pension  
3 department, I have deductions from the source for hos-  
4 pital and Blue Cross. These are deducted from the source  
5 and I get a cheque each month for ninety-three dollars  
6 and ninety cents. That is what I am living on.

7 MR. ESTEY: You would have retired on  
8 pension in 1961?

9 MR. PIFER: That is right.

10 MR. ESTEY: How much would your pension  
11 have been?

12 MR. PIFER: Roughly twenty-five dollars  
13 more, based on my last five years earnings, and I had  
14 that plan which is known as the 1959 pension plan, which  
15 had just come into effect just before I was disabled.  
16 I had subscribed to that before the injury occurred and  
17 if I could get it I would have my best five years to  
18 use as an average to base my pension on. I would have  
19 got twenty-two years and ten months rating on that, plus  
20 I could have increased my average around one thousand  
21 dollars. While my best five years were the last years  
22 I worked around forty-four hundred dollars, but I could  
23 have brought it up close to six thousand dollars for the  
24 last three years and added to it and earned all I could.

25 MR. ESTEY: One more question. Would you  
26 explain why the Brotherhood did not appear for you on  
27 the Appeal Tribunal?

28 MR. PIFER: I didn't ask them to.

29 MR. ESTEY: Did you ask them to, the  
30 Brotherhood, to appear for you before the Board?





Nethercut & Young

2687

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. PIFER: No. Not the Board Hearing.

2 I am better off without them. They would hinder.

3 MR. ESTEY: When did they appear for you,  
4 if they did at all?

5 MR. PIFER: May I say at this stage I had  
6 better support from management, top men within the ranks  
7 of management, the General Manager in Winnipeg and the  
8 Superintendent, and they interceded for me and they  
9 couldn't do anything with their own medical board. They  
10 are handicapped themselves.

11 MR. ESTEY: When did the Brotherhood ap-  
12 pear for you if they ever did in this matter?

13 MR. PIFER: They didn't appear. I asked  
14 them to appear but they wouldn't do it.

15 MR. ESTEY: When was that? At what stage  
16 was that?

17 MR. PIFER: That was before.

18 MR. ESTEY: Away back when the referee  
19 was being appointed?

20 MR. PIFER: I think it was after that.

21 MR. ESTEY: After Dr. Greenwood's examin-  
22 ation?

23 MR. PIFER: I believe it was.

24 MR. ESTEY: That is when you wanted them  
25 to reopen the thing and get the appeal going?

26 MR. PIFER: That is right.

27 MR. ESTEY: They wouldn't do that. Did  
28 they give you any reasons?

29 MR. PIFER: They claimed they couldn't.  
30 I went to the Vice-President, Gordon Gale, in Winnipeg,





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2688

1 and he referred me to the Dominion Legislature, Gordon  
2 McGregor. I went to Ottawa to see him and he said, "Go  
3 back home and take it up through your own lodge." My  
4 own lodge local legislative representative, Fred Culliton,  
5 who is also the Provincial Legislative Representative,  
6 brought my material back and said, "I couldn't do any-  
7 thing with this."

8 MR. ESTEY: He didn't give you any explana-  
9 tion as to why he couldn't?

10 MR. PIFER: Fred Culliton. No he didn't  
11 give me any explanation. I know he doesn't have the  
12 ability in the first place.

13 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Pifer, you have been very  
14 helpful to us. I have no further questions to ask you.  
15 If you have anything to add which I may have interrupted  
16 you in saying, subject to the Commissioner's approval  
17 you might say it now.

18 MR. PIFER: I would like to state I have been  
19 treated very courteously at this hearing today. You have  
20 given me every advantage. I would like to say that the  
21 Compensation Board, who have been described as a secret  
22 or a government tax supported welfare agency --

23 THE COMMISSIONER: They are not, because  
24 the industry supports them. The government does not.

25 MR. PIFER: I think they are. I think in  
26 my letter to you I described it as a tax supported racket.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: It is not supported by  
28 taxes, that is the trouble.

29 MR. PIFER: That is where the trouble lies.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: I didn't say it is the





Nethercut & Young

2689

Toronto, Ontario

1 trouble. It is a misconception in your mind. It is  
2 entirely supported by industry.

3 MR. PIFER: I understand that, but the  
4 Canadian National Medical Board I have had to let ex-  
5 amine me. The Canadian National Medical Board as an  
6 independent organization, and then in turn met them  
7 again as an integral part of the Compensation Board.  
8 The same Board.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Again I tried to explain  
10 to you, I think you are mistaken about that. I know you  
11 are mistaken about that.

12 MR. PIFER: I am not in the position to  
13 argue the point with you or Mr. Estey, and I don't have  
14 the privilege even though I have the learning and I  
15 realize that with a Grade XIII education which I had  
16 fifty-seven years ago, I am confronted with a group of  
17 learned persons and I am not going to argue a point of  
18 law or attempt to.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: I know you must feel  
20 you are at a disadvantage, but I think you are doing  
21 very well. But on this particular thing you now raise  
22 I must accept the statement given me by the Workmen's  
23 Compensation Board, that this Dr. Dwyer did not sit on  
24 the Appeal Tribunal; and I do that for more reasons than  
25 one because it was incredible that he should. Nobody is  
26 entitled to deal with Workmen Compensation matters ex-  
27 cept people who work for the Board. This man doesn't,  
28 and at a later time he appeared and, it was certainly  
29 clear, as the industrial representative. I would have to  
30 accept the statement of the Board on that matter and I





Nethercut & Young

2690

Toronto, Ontario

1 feel you are under a misapprehension at what occurred at  
2 the Appeal Tribunal.

3 MR. PIFER: May I reply? You used the  
4 word "incredible" that Dr. Dwyer would sit as a member  
5 of the Compensation Board. It was incredible to me at  
6 the time that it would occur, and I believe in my letter  
7 to you that I suggested and asked you to get a copy of  
8 the official court reporter's report. Have you seen  
9 that?

10 THE COMMISSIONER: No, I have not seen it.

11 MR. PIFER: I have asked the Compensation  
12 Board to release it and they will not do it, and I am  
13 asking you to get it and you will change your opinion  
14 after reading that, if it is complete. I would like to  
15 see it myself and I would know if any part was deleted.

16 Dr. Dwyer was active as/sitting member of that panel and  
17 I make the statement in my opinion the Canadian National  
18 Railroad Medical Board -- my chief difficulty is that  
19 the payroll -- as a member of a group whose payroll  
20 isn't taxed and that is just why my main difficulty is  
21 two fold.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I may say, Mr. Pifer,  
23 that the representative of the Railway, the Canadian  
24 National Railway, appeared here and his complaint was  
25 Dr. Dwyer and others had to appear for them before the  
26 Appeal Tribunal. The representative felt they shouldn't  
27 have to and the Appeal Tribunal should subpoena this  
28 evidence themselves. He felt it shouldn't be up to in-  
29 dustry to go in there and oppose a case and get bad  
30 employer-employee relations because of it. He is com-





Nethercut & Young

2691

Toronto, Ontario

1 plaining about the thing you are saying.

2 MR. PIFER: I have discussed this with  
3 top officials and may I also state that the Medical  
4 Board, who have made representations and don't want many  
5 restrictions -- right in Fort William there is a case  
6 there now in a pool room. He hops around a table and  
7 plays pool all afternoon and once he gets ready to go  
8 home he gets his crutches and hobbles on them home again,  
9 and that is because his doctor says he is not ready for  
10 work and he gets a day's fee out of it. We have these  
11 things going on and everybody is playing it for a rac-  
12 ket. I am going to ask you and I believe you have the  
13 authority to get it if you so desire, you would have  
14 access to their files, and access to get that court  
15 reporter's report and then form your opinion as to whe-  
16 ther Dr. Dwyer sat in or not. They wouldn't give me a  
17 copy of the report.

18 MR. ESTEY: When did you ask for that?

19 MR. PIFER: This spring.

20 MR. ESTEY: In writing by any chance?

21 MR. PIFER: Yes, writing and telephone.  
22 I have my letter I think.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: This was after your  
24 appeal to the Board, or before?

25 MR. PIFER: Yes.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Before your appeal to  
27 the Board, did you ask for your evidence then? The  
28 transcription of the evidence before the Appeal Tribunal?

29 MR. PIFER: No, I didn't because replies  
30 I had received from the letters have said it was not





Nethercut & Young

2692

Toronto, Ontario

1 secret but used the words "privileged" evidence which  
2 could not be disclosed and there was no use asking for  
3 it.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Was the only evidence  
5 before the Board that was oral, your own?

6 MR. ESTEY: Did you get a reply from the  
7 Board when you asked for a transcript of the Board's  
8 Hearing?

9 MR. PIFER: Will you read this sir. That  
10 is a copy of my letter to the Board.

11 MR. ESTEY: Did you get a reply?

12 MR. PIFER: Some assistant to the assist-  
13 ant would reply.

14 MR. ESTEY: Could you find that for me  
15 do you suppose?

16 MR. PIFER: A reply to that letter is it?

17 MR. ESTEY: Yes.

18 MR. PIFER: What date is that letter?

19 MR. ESTEY: December 13th, 1965. There is  
20 some discussion in your letter that you could get a  
21 copy of the Appeal Tribunal transcript, and apparently  
22 it was available at the Board's Hearing.

23 MR. PIFER: No.

24 MR. ESTEY: Your letter says the Port  
25 Arthur transcript was available at the Board Hearing.

26 MR. PIFER: The Board saw fit to order one,  
27 which is the Port Arthur transcript. There was a court  
28 reporter present at the meeting in Toronto on November  
29 19th and I wrote, "please furnish Mr. Wardrobe and my-  
30 self with a copy for our records."





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2693

1 MR. ESTEY: You are asking them for a  
2 transcript?

3 MR. PIFER: I have a copy of a letter from  
4 Mr. Legge, dated October 6th, 1959, to the Honourable  
5 G.C. Wardrobe, which states I can order a transcript of  
6 the record from an official court reporter in Port  
7 Arthur, but I must bear the expense. That is another  
8 way of wearing a person out financially.

9 MR. ESTEY: That date must be wrong be-  
10 cause the hearing wasn't heard.

11 MR. PIFER: That would be 1965.

12 MR. ESTEY: In any event they said you  
13 could have a transcript if you paid for it of the Port  
14 Arthur hearing?

15 MR. PIFER: I could order a reporter to be  
16 present if I paid for him, and I also have a letter  
17 from the Board here and they named a court reporter from  
18 Port Arthur. I would have to bear the expense.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: We have a court re-  
20 porter here and there was a court reporter on the  
21 Appeal Tribunal. You don't have to pay for the court  
22 reporter but you might have been asked to pay for a  
23 transcript of the evidence, if you wanted to use it be-  
24 fore the Field Tribunal, but I suppose if you were the  
25 only one to give oral evidence there was no point in  
26 getting a transcript before the Board.

27 MR. PIFER: Well, how long can a person  
28 bear expense when there is no income? That is the  
29 question that I have been confronted with. They have  
30 been playing with tax money and I have --





Nethercut & Young

2694

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. ESTEY: What you are saying is that  
2 at the Board meeting here in Toronto, Dr. Dwyer had  
3 something to say and the transcript would prove it.

4 MR. PIFER: The court reporter's report  
5 would prove it and might I add this might be revealing  
6 testimony, but after the meeting was over I went out in  
7 the waiting room and sat down for awhile because I was  
8 tired. The court reporter came out afterwards and un-  
9 solicited he said, "You made a good submission today."  
10 I don't know what kind of a submission I made here today  
11 but you will be the judge of that. I don't know.

12 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Pifer, we have your sub-  
13 mission and it is kind of you to come down here and  
14 tell us your story.

15 MR. PIFER: I did it -- I am attempting  
16 to get what I am entitled to -- my claim is thirty-five  
17 thousand dollars in arrears right now because I am en-  
18 titled to the maximum compensation based on my earnings  
19 of five thousand dollars a year. I will have to tighten  
20 my belt up when I go home again after this trip.

21 MR. ESTEY: Thank you very much, Mr.  
22 Pifer.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Pifer, if you speak  
24 to Mr. Estey he will arrange to pay your hotel accommo-  
25 dations while you were here. We will now recess for  
26 ten minutes.

27  
28  
29 The hearing recessed for  
30 ten minutes.





Nethercut & Young

2695

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. ESTEY: We have Mr. Kerr of the  
2 Workmen's Compensation Board.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: I thought there was  
4 another gentleman.

5 MR. ESTEY: That is a representative of  
6 International Nickel.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: No other individuals  
8 we know about?

9 MR. JOHNSON: I understood Mr. Morton was  
10 coming. He is the deaf man.

11 MR. ESTEY: I have received no other  
12 notices of any kind, Mr. Commissioner, that any other  
13 individuals or anybody else wishes to appear this morn-  
14 ing and, therefore, we have two or three items of busi-  
15 ness left over from earlier proceedings. Mr. Kerr of  
16 the Board is here to deal with two of the items. Mr.  
17 Kerr, you might wish to come forward and, first of all,  
18 a policy order was issued by the Board in connection  
19 with the aggravation of pre-existing injuries, as dis-  
20 cussed with Dr. Kavanagh.

21 MR. KERR: Mr. Commissioner, when Dr.  
22 Kavanagh was giving evidence in aggravation of pre-  
23 existing conditions, he mentioned prior to 1964 the  
24 workmen received half of his full pension. An example  
25 used was a man who had a pre-existing diabetic condition,  
26 and lost a portion of his leg, would receive half his  
27 normal pension. Commencing in December, 1964, the policy  
28 was changed whereby a man under these circumstances  
29 would receive full pension, and not just half pension.  
30 We were requested to file a copy of the Board's order





Nethercut & Young

2696

Toronto, Ontario

1 authorizing that change, which I am so doing. The order  
2 is dated December 2nd, 1964.

3 MR. ESTEY: Do you have any extra copies?

4 MR. KERR: I am sorry, I just have the one.

5 MR. JOHNSON: This will be Exhibit "45".

6 EXHIBIT "45": Copy of Board's Order  
7 dated December 2nd, 1964,  
filed.

8 MR. KERR: May I go on to the next point?

9 MR. ESTEY: Yes.

10 MR. KERR: The Motor Vehicle Manufacturers'  
11 Brief suggested that the Board should take the same care  
12 in adjudicating small claims as we do in adjudicating  
13 more expensive claims. By small claims they meant claims  
14 for compensation when the lost time is a relatively short  
15 period of time, as compared with a lost time case involv-  
16 ing perhaps a more lengthy period of time.

17 MR. ESTEY: Claims for which the lost time  
18 claim is relatively short?

19 MR. KERR: As opposed to lost time claims  
20 where there is a long period of disability.

21 In handling these short item claims we use  
22 the same approach and same technicalities as we do in the  
23 more extensive type of claims, where there is a lengthy  
24 period of lost time. We must make full inquiry as to  
25 whether the man is a workman under the Act. We must es-  
26 tablish the accident occurred during the course of employ-  
27 ment, and arose out of employment, and to do this we use  
28 the same approach as in the more extensive type of claim.  
29 We obtain the information in the first instance by corres-  
30 pondence and forms. If an investigation of a short lost





Nethercut & Young

2697

Toronto, Ontario

1 time disability is necessary, we will send a field claims  
2 investigator to the locality to get the details of these  
3 small claims. We must, where necessary, obtain a medical  
4 opinion to determine the causal relationship of the con-  
5 dition diagnosed.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: If an investigation of a  
7 small claim is necessary an investigation is made?

8 MR. KERR: That is right, sir.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: This is done by an in-  
10 vestigator?

11 MR. KERR: One of the claims investigators  
12 would go to the locality to gain all the details neces-  
13 sary to adjudicate the claim.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: And the medical opinion?

15 MR. KERR: We must, where necessary, obtain  
16 medical opinions from our medical department concerned,  
17 as to the causal relationship between the condition diag-  
18 nosed by the attending doctor and the accident reported.

19 Assuming that the claim is compensable and  
20 is allowed as coming within the Act, we then pay compen-  
21 sation on the basis of medical evidence, the same as we  
22 do for the long term compensation cases, so our approach  
23 to lost time claims in adjudication is the same for a man  
24 who will be off for six months, as it would be for four  
25 or five days.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: I thought you agreed in  
27 small claims that there was some way in which you settled  
28 them with less investigation?

29 MR. KERR: Those are medical aid claims  
30 only, where there is no lost time.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2696

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Medical claims only, but  
2 as far as small claims are concerned they are treated in  
3 the same manner, in all respects as the larger claims?

4 MR. KERR: Exactly, sir.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: In other words, the  
6 statement made in the brief of the, I think, the Motor  
7 Vehicle Manufacturers' Association, that there is a prac-  
8 tice growing up in the Board of paying all small claims  
9 without investigation is not correct?

10 MR. KERR: That is not correct, sir.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: It is true the investi-  
12 gation is the same. In other words by mail, most of it?

13 MR. KERR: We start off by mail but if it  
14 can't be resolved that way --

15 THE COMMISSIONER: What if the manufacturer  
16 in one of these cases raised some question, would you then  
17 send out an investigator or something like this?

18 MR. KERR: We would, sir.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: But insofar as medical  
20 expenses, or medical bills are concerned, they are paid  
21 without question if the lost time is short?

22 MR. KERR: No.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Where there is no lost  
24 time?

25 MR. KERR: Where there is no lost time they  
26 are not paid without question. They are adjudicated  
27 medical "A" claims only. We do adjudicate them, they are  
28 not paid automatically, but the extent of our inquiry  
29 would not be as great as the lost time claims. In many  
30 instances we are more inclined to give the benefit of the





Nethercut & Young

2699

Toronto, Ontario

1 doubt to the workman.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: I understand.

3 MR. ESTEY: Something bothers me about that.  
4 In the Motor Vehicle Brief it doesn't say whether it is a  
5 lost time claim or not, but says, "We have observed indica-  
6 tions that they will pay without full inquiry," I take  
7 it so far as you are concerned, you can't tell whether  
8 this was a small claim with or without lost time?

9 MR. KERR: I think it was established during  
10 his testimony that this was a lost time case, if I recall  
11 correctly.

12 MR. ESTEY: I have not got to the case.  
13 This is just a general principle, I take it. The general  
14 principle could relate to lost time or medical aid claims.  
15 He says he questions the wisdom of settlement based on a  
16 doctor's opinion rather than its merits as such a practice  
17 could lead to problems or fraudulent claims. More par-  
18 ticularly, it could establish grounds for reopening a  
19 claim for further benefits in later years. I take it  
20 what they are saying is whether the claim is for lost  
21 time or medical aid only, it still could form the basis  
22 of a subsequent or more serious claim later on, for the  
23 same type of injury.

24 MR. KERR: No claim is subject to reopening.

25 MR. ESTEY: The foundation of a claim, in  
26 their opinion, which may be frivolous or fraudulent might  
27 be laid by a medical aid claim, and the brief really is  
28 saying you should pay the same vigilance to a medical aid  
29 claim, albeit small, as a major claim.

30 MR. KERR: It could be interpreted that way.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2700

1                   MR. ESTEY: In support of the brief, Mr.  
2 Tuz, on behalf of Chrysler Canada Limited filed what be-  
3 came Exhibit "10". It is a letter signed by E.C. Dowd,  
4 M.D., Surgical Department of the Workmen's Compensation  
5 Board. The letter is dated May 11th of this year and it  
6 refers to a claim number but nothing turns on the indivi-  
7 dual claim. This is what the letter says:

8                   "Our Medical Department has to weigh the  
9 evidence and come to what we feel is a just  
10 decision. While we could certainly investi-  
11 gate everything very thoroughly by bringing  
12 the claimant to the Board's offices for  
13 examination, we must surely see in a case  
14 such as the one under discussion the costs  
15 involved far outweigh any advantages that  
16 might occur."

17                  I would suggest the correspondence in  
18 this appeal is because of the cost of the claim which was  
19 in the seventy-five dollar category. You have seen this  
20 Exhibit "10"?

21                  MR. KERR: I have.

22                  MR. ESTEY: I don't know whether that is a  
23 claim for lost time or a medical claim, do you know?

24                  MR. KERR: Yes. Excuse me, I think I have  
25 it in my notes.

26                  MR. ESTEY: I would guess it is a claim for  
27 lost time.

28                  MR. KERR: It is a claim for lost time,  
29 there is no doubt about that. Is this the claim, 6704347?

30                  MR. ESTEY: Yes. I would like you to ex-





Nethercut & Young

2701

Toronto, Ontario

1 plain Dr. Dowd's comment, "That you must surely see in a  
2 case such as the one under discussion the costs far out-  
3 weigh the advantages of what might occur."

4 MR. KERR: That is right. It is not profit-  
5 able to investigate small claims and therefore we don't.

6 MR. ESTEY: That is the way I would read  
7 that letter but perhaps it is not the Board's policy.

8 MR. KERR: Perhaps I should read the com-  
9 plaint of Mr. P. Tuz of Chrysler who submits full compen-  
10 sation should not be paid in this case and it will lead  
11 up to your point.

12 MR. ESTEY: Is this a letter back to Chrys-  
13 ler?

14 MR. KERR: No. A report to the Royal Com-  
15 mission on this case.

16 MR. ESTEY: All right.

17 MR. KERR: They submit full compensation  
18 should not be paid in this case since the company doctor  
19 felt the workman could return to modified work. The work-  
20 man smashed the top of his ring finger, right hand, as a  
21 result of an accident on February 1st, 1966, at 11:50 P.M.  
22 He was treated by Dr. so-and-so, and I must delete the  
23 names for obvious reasons, on February 2nd. His report  
24 to the Board stated the workman could return February 7th.  
25 Compensation was paid from February 2nd to February 7th.  
26 The workman was examined by Dr. so-and-so, the company  
27 medical advisor on February 3rd. He considered the work-  
28 man fit for modified employment which was refused by the  
29 workman, in view of the former doctor's opinion. The  
30 company submitted that compensation should not be paid for





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2702

1 the period of lost time. The employer's report of the  
2 accident was dated February 3rd, but was not received by  
3 the Board until February 18th, 1966, at 8:20 A.M. The  
4 employer appealed the Claims Department decision and the  
5 Review Committee informed the employer of the decision and  
6 included a summary of opinion. Mr. Spate of Chrysler  
7 Canada Limited requested guidance as to a difference of  
8 opinion between the workman's physician and company doctor,  
9 with respect to whether or not the workman should return  
10 to modified employment. This letter was misinterpreted  
11 by the medical advisor. This is the letter you are refer-  
12 ring to. Where doctors disagree the Company should be in-  
13 formed if a doctor felt a workman could return to modified  
14 employment. He should discuss the case with the attending  
15 physician. If there is concurrence that the workman  
16 do modified work, he should return to the work approved b.  
17 his doctor. In making this decision one must take into  
18 consideration the man's condition and the possibility of  
19 increased hazard for the workman, and the possibility of  
20 increasing the hazards to fellow workmen. Where doctors  
21 disagree, if the company medical advisor is of the opinion  
22 that the injured workman can return to his employment and  
23 this opinion is not shared by the workman's attending  
24 physician, the Board should be notified immediately.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: You say in this case the  
26 Board received no report from the company until the 18th,  
27 and the accident happened on the 3rd?

28 MR. KERR: That is right, the accident on  
29 the 3rd stretched over until the 7th, and the employer's  
30 report was received in our office on February 18th.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2703

1                   THE COMMISSIONER: I think I understood  
2 from your representatives and from my own survey of the  
3 Board that you seek to make decisions and get payment  
4 cheques out as soon as possible. In fact one of the  
5 criticisms is you do not get them out fast enough, so I  
6 suppose at the end of the week you try to make some de-  
7 cision and get an answer back?

8                   MR. KERR: In this case the employer is  
9 not contesting the allowance of the claim. What they  
10 are saying is we should not have paid compensation since  
11 in their opinion the man should have returned to work.  
12 This is what they are complaining about.

13                  THE COMMISSIONER: So what you are saying  
14 is that at this stage if they had some question they  
15 should let you know as promptly as possible? In this  
16 case the company did know on the 3rd.

17                  MR. KERR: Their company doctor examined  
18 the man on the 3rd, the day after the accident, and had  
19 they contacted us by telephone we would have arranged  
20 for a local doctor in Windsor, a specialist, to examine  
21 the man and find out if he could return to that work.  
22 Unfortunately, our letter to the medical officer did not  
23 make that clear.

24                  MR. ESTEY: The first problem is, if you  
25 had found out the difference in time, you would have a  
26 third opinion? The Board doesn't try to choose between one  
27 or the other. They try to get a neutral opinion before  
28 they leave it on the medical claims only. Does the  
29 Board have any policy for speeding up payments, not auto-  
30 matically, but speeding payments for less than twenty-





Nethercut & Young

2704

Toronto, Ontario

1 five dollars?

2 MR. KERR: We have a large volume of claims  
3 here. They have to be adjudicated insofar as, is the  
4 employer under the Act, is the man an employee under the  
5 employer? This is not time consuming but quickly done.  
6 We have to determine whether the accident arose out of  
7 employment and occurred during the course of employment.  
8 These factors must be determined. We are more inclined  
9 to give the benefit of the doubt when it comes to the  
10 relationship of lifting accidents, when there is a small  
11 amount such as his doctor's account --

12 MR. ESTEY: What happens when the claim is  
13 reopened at a later date?

14 MR. KERR: When a claim is reopened at a  
15 later date, we have to find out his condition at that  
16 time. Is it related to the accident reported and had  
17 been allowed for medical aid, or if a claim is reopened  
18 we have to take another look at it to see that the case  
19 of the reopening is related to the accident reported.  
20 Sometimes it is and sometimes it is entirely different.

21 MR. ESTEY: Taking a simple case. A man  
22 gets cut but it doesn't bother him and he needs a stitch  
23 or a clamp and gets some stitches. He gets a doctor's  
24 bill about a week later and it comes to fifteen dollars.  
25 He sends it in to the employer and the employer sends it  
26 to the Board?

27 MR. KERR: Usually the doctor sends the  
28 fifteen dollar account directly to us and we request a  
29 report from the employer.

30 MR. ESTEY: So I have a bill and you have





Nethercut & Young

2705

Toronto, Ontario

1 a bill direct from the doctor and with it is a Form 7  
2 or whatever it is?

3 MR. KERR: Just a medical aid account from  
4 the doctor. Not a lost time accident.

5 MR. ESTEY: This fellow didn't miss any  
6 time?

7 MR. KERR: Right. We don't require a Form  
8 8. Just an account.

9 MR. ESTEY: How do you investigate anything?  
10 All you have is a doctor's bill.

11 MR. KERR: We have a bill which gives the  
12 man's name, the name of the employer, the accident, and  
13 the nature of injury.

14 MR. ESTEY: As a matter of ironclad rou-  
15 tine, what do you do next?

16 MR. KERR: We request a report from the  
17 employer.

18 MR. ESTEY: And what does that come in on?

19 MR. KERR: Form 7. An employer's report  
20 of an accident.

21 MR. ESTEY: So the only report you don't  
22 have on this claim is the first doctor's report so there  
23 is a delay while you get that from the employer, and the  
24 employer's report comes in so what do you do next?

25 MR. KERR: We adjudicate the claim to see  
26 if the accident came within the course of employment. We  
27 pay the account. The man is not involved because there  
28 is no compensation.

29 MR. ESTEY: Not involved, except if he has  
30 to pay the hospital and the doctor, the doctor is advised?





Nethercut & Young

2706

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. KERR: The hospital no. We have a  
2 hospital account set up for that.

3 MR. ESTEY: So the doctor goes after the  
4 man to pay the bill instead of the Board?

5 MR. KERR: I assume he does.

6 MR. ESTEY: I take it from what you say,  
7 but I want to be clear, there is no policy where the  
8 Board automatically pays the small medical claims?

9 MR. KERR: No. The claims are adjudicated.

10 MR. ESTEY: Not by an individual?

11 MR. KERR: No. Adjudicated by medical  
12 officers in our medical claims section, a claims officer  
13 and a supervisor.

14 MR. ESTEY: Is one of them doing non-lost  
15 time accidents only, or how do you do that?

16 MR. KERR: We have ten claims sections for  
17 compensable claims, lost time claims, medical aid claims,  
18 which deals entirely with no lost time accidents, medi-  
19 cal claims only.

20 MR. ESTEY: And that is reviewed exactly  
21 in the same way as any other claim?

22 MR. KERR: That is right.

23 MR. ESTEY: Thank you, Mr. Kerr. Is Mr.  
24 MacDonald coming?

25 MR. KERR: He said he would be here.

26 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Commissioner, we have some  
27 items as a result of earlier proceedings, and it would  
28 appear appropriate to have them placed on the record be-  
29 fore you. First of all, a subsequent submission by the  
30 United Steel Workers of America, on the issue as to





Nethercut & Young

2707

Toronto, Ontario

1 whether or not there are to be funds turned over to the  
2 Workmen's Compensation Board of British Columbia, as  
3 part of their responsibility in connection with accident  
4 prevention, and Mr. Ingle, who appeared before the Royal  
5 Commission, has forwarded a letter from the Workmen's  
6 Compensation of British Columbia dated 24th October, 1966,  
7 which says in part as follows: "Accident prevention cost  
8 is charged to each class in accordance with its propor-  
9 tion of total assessment. No doubt the Commission has  
10 a copy of our Annual Report filed in the Legislature.  
11 Reference is made to Schedule I, operating expenses,  
12 which includes accident prevention." Referring to Ex-  
13 hibit "B" which is a breakdown of operating expenses into  
14 accident prevention, industrial hygiene and first day in-  
15 vestigation it stressed, "Control is part of industrial  
16 hygiene." I will avoid reading it all. It goes on,  
17 "I confirm no contribution is paid from the Consolidation  
18 Fund of British Columbia for, or towards the Accident  
19 Prevention Department."

20 THE SECRETARY: This will be Exhibit "46".

21 EXHIBIT "46": Letter from the United  
22 Steel Workers of America  
23 dated 24th October, 1966,  
24 filed.

25 Then sir, we have received some corres-  
26 pondence this morning from Mr. Anderson of the Industrial  
27 Accident Prevention Association.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: In British Columbia,  
29 their Accident Prevention Department goes further with a  
30 provision that any enforcement matter is under its juris-  
diction as well, is it not?





Nethercut & Young

2708

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. ESTEY: Yes, Mr. Commissioner.

2 We have received this morning from the  
3 Industrial Accident Prevention Association, signed by  
4 its General Manager, two letters dated the 28th October,  
5 1966, in which Mr. Anderson forwards a number of documents  
6 to which he made reference during his appearance before  
7 the Commission. The documents include the report, or  
8 programme guide rather, for the instructions by I.A.P.A.,  
9 in accident prevention and safety procedures. Also en-  
10 closed is a set of general rules and standards adopted  
11 by the I.A.P.A. This is a rather interesting document.  
12 It appears to be a code of safety procedures and regu-  
13 lations, whether enforceable or not, and they appear as  
14 regulations which state on the face of them they have  
15 been approved by the Workmen's Compensation Board and  
16 the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The printed version  
17 has a date on it, "Reprinted, December, 1944." I don't  
18 know where the originators were set out but it was app-  
19 roved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council in the ses-  
20 sions of 1919, authorized under Section 116 of the Work-  
21 men's Compensation Act, which refers to the establishment  
22 of the Association.

23 The other documents in the bundle of docu-  
24 ments so forwarded by the I.A.P.A., include the reference  
25 to the subject of one Dr. Roberts, in the labour con-  
26 vention in Geneva, Switzerland, where the statement was  
27 made eighty-five percent of all accidents were due to  
28 carelessness and fifteen percent by the machinery in  
29 question. Those are the most important and the by-laws  
30 of the I.A.P.A., are also included. With your permission





Nethercut & Young

2709

Toronto, Ontario

1 I would like to file them as an Exhibit.

2 THE SECRETARY: This will be Exhibit "47".

3 EXHIBIT "47": Documents received from  
4 the I.A.P.A., under date  
28th October, 1966, filed.

5 There is an editorial comment in the  
6 covering letter, Mr. Commissioner, that I would suggest  
7 we read. It is a reiteration of the stand given to us  
8 by the I.A.P.A., officers to us when they were here.

9 Then we have a submission by the Canadian  
10 Tooling Manufacturers' Association, National Council.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Was the Steel Workers'  
12 letter Exhibit "46"?

13 THE SECRETARY: Yes, Mr. Commissioner.

14 MR. ESTEY: We now come to the Canadian  
15 Tooling Manufacturers' Association, National Council.  
16 letter dated 25th October, 1966. It is a one sentence  
17 letter to the effect they strongly support the stand  
18 taken by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association as out-  
19 lined in their brief to the Commission. It is signed  
20 Daniel C. Kay, Jr., Executive Secretary.

21 THE SECRETARY: This will be Exhibit "48".

22 EXHIBIT "48": Letter dated 25th October,  
23 1966 from the Canadian  
24 Tooling Manufacturers'  
25 Association, filed.

26 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Commissioner, we now come  
27 to the question of the residue of briefs, which are the  
28 individual's briefs, who have not appeared today. Some of  
29 them we have touched on rather fully. Mr. Pifer we have  
30 dealt with. Neptune Meters has been read in, Mr. Morton  
brief was dealt with. We have Dr. Alexander Fee and the





Nethercut & Young

2710

Toronto, Ontario

1 Canadian Hearing Society. That leaves a residue of some  
2 eight or nine.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: I would suggest that I  
4 think the A. & T. Wrecking and Salvage Company should go  
in in full. It is not so long is it? As far as the  
5 various other ones are concerned from the individuals,  
6 in most cases they are really seeking to appeal decisions  
7 of the Board in matters upon which I have not the power  
8 to deal. However, in each of them they do raise some  
9 questions of policy which should be considered by this  
10 Commission, and as a consequence I think in those letters  
11 you can restrict yourselves to those portions of the  
12 letter in which various questions of policy are raised,  
13 if you find you are able to do that. If not, they will  
14 all have to be read in.

16 MR. ESTEY: MR. LINDSAY: I think in a moment  
17 tion companies we will come to in a moment  
18 which is most satisfactory from our viewpoint. I have  
19 brief from an individual which raises the general pro-  
20 blems having to do with compensation and comes in from  
21 Mr. Murdo Martin, a member of Parliament, I believe, for  
22 a riding in the northern part of the province. He does  
23 deal with an adjudication in an individual case, but the  
24 opening part of his brief deals with gold miners' chest  
25 problems. I suggest we read that in as well. It has not  
26 been dealt with.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: I think this gentleman  
28 should be heard first, and perhaps Mr. MacDonald we can  
29 hear from you now and carry on with the others later.

30 MR. ESTEY: Mr. MacDonald, you have been





Nethercut & Young

2711

Toronto, Ontario

1 well identified on the record as treasurer of the Board.

2 I understand we will review the branch offices of the  
3 Board and the nature of them?

4 MR. MACDONALD: Thank you, Mr. Estey. I  
5 apologize for being delayed at a Board meeting which  
6 didn't finish when it should have.

7 Under the heading of "Regional Offices"  
8 and the subheading of "Audit Offices", the Board periodi-  
9 cally audits the payroll records of all employers in the  
10 province on a county by county basis. Before the in-  
11 dustrial expansion of the late 1940s and 1950s, small  
12 groups of auditors spent short periods in more distant  
13 parts of the province and travelled to and from the Tor-  
14 onto office. As industry expanded, so audit volume in-  
15 creased and distance and travelling time became an ad-  
16 ministrative problem.

17 In 1950, a Senior Auditor was sent to the  
18 Lakehead on a permanent basis to audit records in the  
19 districts of Thunder Bay, Rainy River, Kenora, Patricia,  
20 and Winnipeg. As the work grew, additional audit staff  
21 were appointed and an office was opened in 1951.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: You mentioned Winnipeg.  
23 That would be a company with headquarters in Winnipeg  
24 carrying on work in the Province of Ontario?

25 MR. MACDONALD: In the Province of Ontario,  
26 yes, sir.

27 In 1952, a similar office was opened by a  
28 Senior Auditor in Ottawa for audit work in the Counties  
29 of Carlton, Dundas, Grenville, Prescott, Renfrew, Russell,  
30 Stormont and Glengarry.





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2710

1                   In May, 1955, an office was opened in  
2 Windsor primarily for the purpose of auditing employers'  
3 records in the Counties of Essex, Kent and Lambton.

4                   In June, 1956, an audit office was opened  
5 in North Bay for audit work in Algoma, Cochrane, Hali-  
6 burton, Manitoulin, Muskoka, Nipissing, Parry Sound,  
7 Sudbury and Temiskaming.

8                   Under the subheading "St. Lawrence Seaway  
9 Office", in November, 1954, a temporary office was  
10 opened in Cornwall to serve the needs of the Board in  
11 relation to the huge influx of employers and workmen for  
12 the construction of the seaway. This small office was  
13 closed in August, 1959, as the Seaway reached completion

14                  Under the subheading of "Modern Communi-  
15 cations", as the offices in the Lakehead, Ottawa and  
16 Windsor became established, the volume increased. In  
17 addition to audit work on which the greater portion of  
18 the staff were employed, the offices also dealt with  
19 enquiries from Head Office concerning employers' oper-  
20 ations and accidents to their workmen. The district  
21 staff obtained information and reports for Head Office  
22 departments to speed decision making at the Toronto Of-  
23 fice. Conversely, they obtained information from the  
24 Head Office to answer local enquiries.

25                  Teletype services were installed in the  
26 regional offices to speed the flow of information be-  
27 tween Head Office and the regional staff and later telex  
28 equipment was installed in some locations. Telex enables  
29 subscribers to deal directly by wire with either the  
30 District or Head Office.





Nethercut & Young

2713

Toronto, Ontario

1                   Under the heading "Claims Investigation  
2 and Rehabilitation Services", as the services of the  
3 regional offices broadened, additional staff was allo-  
4 cated. In 1953, for the same reasons that audit staff  
5 had been originally relocated, Claims Investigators were  
6 assigned to the Lakehead and Ottawa offices. In each  
7 instance, the volume of investigations in the districts  
8 was such that economies could be realized. Claims In-  
9 vestigators obtained all the facts on difficult claims  
10 to enable the Toronto staff to decide entitlement.

11                  The Board's duty is to enquire into the  
12 true merits and justice of the case and to ensure equity,  
13 consistency and conformity in speed and adjudication.  
14 Decisions are made in the Head Office and not in the  
15 Districts

16                  Rehabilitation Officers were appointed to  
17 the District Offices in the mid 1950s to provide them  
18 with more time for personal contacts in their territories  
19 by avoiding the travelling to and from Toronto. A good  
20 Rehabilitation Officer must be known in his district and  
21 must know his district.

22                  With these changes and the diversification  
23 of services, the offices were renamed District Offices.  
24 The District Representatives, in addition to their basic  
25 function of managing the Board's local facilities, act  
26 in a public service capacity by providing general infor-  
27 mation about the Board and attending meetings and semi-  
28 nars to talk on compensation matters.

29                  A further District Office was opened in  
30 Kitchener in September, 1956, to deal with the variety





Nethercut & Young

2714

Toronto, Ontario

1 of assessment and claims problems occurring in the  
2 Counties of Waterloo, Wellington, Huron and Perth. A  
3 Claims Officer was assigned to the North Bay Office in  
4 June, 1959, and Rehabilitation Officers were added sub-  
5 sequently.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, well now how many  
7 District Offices are there then?

8 MR. MACDONALD: There are seven District  
9 Offices.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Seven, and at the  
11 District Office for each District Office you have an  
12 auditor?

13 MR. MACDONALD: In every case there are  
14 auditors but they are varied in number depending on the  
15 number of forms there may be in the actual area.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: There are one or more  
17 auditors?

18 MR. MACDONALD: Actually two or more in  
19 every District Office.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: A Claims Investigator?

21 MR. MACDONALD: Not Claims Investigators  
22 in every office. In some offices the Assistant District  
23 Manager will do a certain amount of claims investigation.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: In each of these offices  
25 there is a District Manager first, is there?

26 MR. MACDONALD: A District Manager and an  
27 Assistant District Manager.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: In each of them?

29 MR. MACDONALD: Yes. In each of them  
30 there are two or more auditors and we can detail them





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2715

1 for you. There are not Rehabilitation Officers in every  
2 district.

3 MR. ESTEY: No Rehabilitation Officer in  
4 Windsor or North Bay, I take it?

5 MR. MACDONALD: There is a Rehabilitation  
6 Officer in Windsor and actually two operating out of  
7 North Bay. One is located in the Sudbury Branch Office  
8 in fact, which is the chest examination station.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: You talk in one sense  
10 about claims investigators, and in the latter paragraph  
11 you say "claims officer" was assigned.

12 MR. MACDONALD: Yes, the claims officer  
13 is somewhat of a misnomer. He is not a claims officer  
14 making decisions as a claims officer. He is a claims  
15 trained person getting information necessary about  
16 claims in the area, and doing some investigations and  
17 also knowledgeable to answer questions about procedures,  
18 when claims come to the district office.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: You say there isn't  
20 one of these in each office?

21 MR. MACDONALD: No. In some cases this  
22 particular function is carried out by the district re-  
23 presentative and assistant district representative.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: What other duties would  
25 the assistant representative in a district have?

26 MR. MACDONALD: Briefly their job is to  
27 handle the district activity, but their main function is  
28 to act as a public service representative of the Board  
29 in the area. They are quite active in attending meet-  
30 ings and talking on compensation matters.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2716

1 MR. ESTEY: You mentioned seven offices,  
2 but I only count five in your brief, Lakehead, Ottawa,  
3 Windsor, North Bay and Kitchener.

4 MR. MACDONALD: I may have lost count.

5 MR. ESTEY: You have a Branch Office in  
6 Sudbury?

7 MR. MACDONALD: Yes, that is right. Five  
8 plus the sixth at Sudbury.

9 MR. ESTEY: And the one in Toronto makes  
10 the seventh?

11 MR. MACDONALD: That is right.

12 MR. ESTEY: Sudbury is an x-ray office  
13 opened up by a Rehabilitation Officer?

14 MR. MACDONALD: Due to the special needs  
15 in that area to assist the Rehabilitation Officer in  
16 the Sudbury Office, and to provide communication by  
17 telex in that area to speed inquiry.

18 MR. ESTEY: Could I interrupt and ask you  
19 why you have a Branch Office in North Bay, with a popu-  
20 lation of twenty-one thousand, I guess it is, and Sud-  
21 bury with a population of one hundred and five thousand  
22 you have just a sort of sub branch?

23 MR. MACDONALD: Perhaps, if I may go on  
24 to tell you what serves the area --

25 MR. ESTEY: North Bay is a District Office  
26 territory?

27 MR. MACDONALD: In Algoma which settled  
28 one thousand two hundred and eighty-three claims had  
29 one thousand five hundred and sixty-four firms.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Algoma would include





Nethercut & Young

1717

Toronto, Ontario

1 the Sault, I suppose, would it?

2 MR. MACDONALD: Yes.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: And all that area  
4 around the Sault?

5 MR. MACDONALD: Yes. In the Haliburton  
6 area we had ninety-four claims with two hundred and  
7 ninety-eight firms. In Manitoulin thirty eight claims  
8 with two hundred and sixty-six firms. In Muskoka two  
9 hundred and fifty-eight claims and nine hundred and  
10 sixty-five firms. In Nipissing we had seven hundred and  
11 eighty-five claims with one thousand two hundred and  
12 five firms. In Parry Sound there were two hundred and  
13 fifty-one claims and seven hundred and seventy-three  
14 firms. In Sudbury there were one thousand eight hundred  
15 and thirteen claims and one thousand seven hundred and  
16 ninety-eight firms. In Temiskaming we had two thousand  
17 seven hundred and fifty-four claims with one thousand  
18 nine hundred and eighty-five firms.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Does Temiskaming in-  
20 clude Timmins? What district is Timmins in?

21 MR. MACDONALD: I didn't check that point,  
22 my geography isn't all that good.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Kerr, do you know?

24 MR. KERR: We will get the answer later.

25 THE SECRETARY: Cochrane is the district  
26 up there.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Cochrane isn't mention-  
28 ed.

29 MR. ESTEY: Is Cochrane included in one  
30 of these sets of figures you give us?





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2718

1                   MR. MACDONALD: Cochrane is serviced by  
2                   our Port Arthur Office.

3                   MR. ESTEY: It says on Page I it is ser-  
4                   ved for audit purposes by your North Bay Office.

5                   MR. MACDONALD: We have a situation depen-  
6                   dent on the work volume encompassed by the two offices  
7                   so that we interchange the different work of these two  
8                   locations.

9                   THE COMMISSIONER: It says on Page I that  
10                  the North Bay Office covers Cochrane. You didn't men-  
11                  tion it here and this is the one we are interested in.

12                  MR. ESTEY: It says for audit only.

13                  MR. MACDONALD: That is the point I am  
14                  making. We are dealing with the audit situation.

15                  THE COMMISSIONER: You are aware there is  
16                  an application from the Town of Timmins to have District  
17                  Officers established in Timmins, or a District Office?

18                  MR. MACDONALD: Yes, sir. We are aware of  
19                  that.

20                  All work relating to the firms and claims  
21                  in these counties is handled from the North Bay Office  
22                  with the exception of Vocational Rehabilitation. Since  
23                  two Rehabilitation Officers are needed to deal with the  
24                  Vocational Rehabilitation cases in Northern Ontario, one  
25                  man is stationed in North Bay and covers Kirkland Lake,  
26                  Cochrane, Timmins and Kapuskasing, and intermediate  
27                  points, and the other is stationed in Sudbury and covers  
28                  Sudbury, Elliot Lake, Blind River and Sault Ste. Marie  
29                  and intermediate points.

30                  Claims investigation and liaison work re-





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2719

1 quiring personal contact is dealt with by the Assistant  
2 District Representative located in North Bay who visits  
3 Timmins as frequently as is necessary to deal with the  
4 problems arising there. Other staff are engaged on  
5 specialized assessment and audit work and visit all in-  
6 dustries in the territory on a rotation basis and on  
7 request.

8 Under the next subheading "Sudbury Chest  
9 Examining Station", the Miners' Chest Examining Station  
10 located in Sudbury operates on the same basis as other  
11 Chest Examining Stations in Kirkland Lake, Timmins, and  
12 the Lakehead. However, because of the Board's need to  
13 communicate with the Rehabilitation Officer in Sudbury  
14 in Sudbury and the large concentration of industry in  
15 the immediate vicinity, a telex machine has been instal-  
16 led to forward phone and personal enquiries to the  
17 Board's Head Office in Toronto and replies are directed  
18 through the same method. Telex subscribers in the Sud-  
19 bury area as in any other area may deal directly with  
20 the Board's Office in Toronto through the Telex network

21 THE COMMISSIONER: I know nothing about  
22 Telex. This is a private system similar to the telephon-  
23 system that you use, is it?

24 MR. MACDONALD: I am not personally famil-  
25 iar with the method used, but when you are tied into  
26 that network you have direct contact to a similar mach-  
27 ine installed in the various users' offices. You can  
28 communicate directly through its network to the other  
29 users of the network.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Anybody in Timmins who





Nethercut & Young

2720

Toronto, Ontario

1 has telex can communicate with North Bay or Toronto  
2 directly?

3 MR. MACDONALD: It is a question of mes-  
4 sages being printed out.

5 MR. ESTEY: It is the same as your tele-  
6 phone, including the dial. You can phone a northern  
7 subscriber and if they have telex you can communicate  
8 there. Instead of talking you leave tracks.

9 MR. MACDONALD: The message is printed at  
10 the other end as you indicate. It is printed rather  
11 than spoken.

12 MR. ESTEY: Before you leave this, and  
13 I don't know how important it is, but I see on Page III  
14 North Bay Rehabilitation Officer covers Cochrane.

15 MR. MACDONALD: To answer your question  
16 it is Temiskaming and Cochrane, covered by the District  
17 of Temiskaming. Temiskaming and Cochrane are Districts

18 THE COMMISSIONER: So this number of  
19 claims covers Temiskaming and Cochrane?

20 MR. MACDONALD: I think it does. Accord-  
21 ing to my map it shows Temiskaming and Cochrane together.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: What I would like to  
23 know, how many claims come out of Timmins? Or if not  
24 Timmins, out of Cochrane?

25 MR. MACDONALD: I have that in my notes  
26 somewhere here, sir.

27 MR. ESTEY: Perhaps you are coming to  
28 that. The Timmins Chest Examination Station, Mr. Mac-  
29 Donald.

30 MR. MACDONALD: I guess it doesn't answer





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2721

1 how many are in Timmins. It says the volume from Tem-  
2 iskaming, which includes Cochrane is approximately three-  
3 eights of the total volume of the entire area.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Three-eights?

5 MR. ESTEY: Of the two districts?

6 MR. MACDONALD: Yes. Three-eights of the  
7 total volume handled by North Bay comes from Temiskaming  
8 County, which includes Timmins. The volume of claims  
9 reported from Temiskaming County, which includes the  
10 City of Timmins, is approximately three-eights of the  
11 total volume for the entire area.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: You now tell us it is  
13 Temiskaming and Cochrane. That is, the two thousand  
14 seven hundred and fifty-four you show as claims is about  
15 one-third of the total?

16 MR. ESTEY: We had a problem with that  
17 statement but we have the authority of the Almanac and  
18 Mr. Johnson is right. Timmins is in Temiskaming and  
19 Cochrane. Those figures include the District of Temis-  
20 kaming and Cochrane and those added together amount to  
21 three-eights of the total.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: That is right but it  
23 doesn't answer the question.

24 MR. MACDONALD: It doesn't answer the  
25 question of how many from Timmins.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: From the County or the  
27 District?

28 THE SECRETARY: They shouldn't be called  
29 Counties, they are Districts.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: We are going to be





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2722

1 given that information are we? I would like to have  
2 that.

3 MR. MACDONALD: The number from the City  
4 of Timmins, we would have difficulty analyzing it on a  
5 city basis. We don't have city breakdowns. We have a  
6 city breakdown of the number of firms but not of the  
7 number of claims.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Temiskaming and Coch-  
9 rane is a pretty large area. You have paper and pulp  
10 mills and, in any event, lumbering.

11 MR. MACDONALD: Again our coding is on  
12 the basis of the combined Districts of Temiskaming and  
13 Cochrane. We would have to do quite a bit of work to  
14 analyze if they were out of those two Districts.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Timmins has failed to  
16 produce anything to help us, but I thought I would get  
17 it from you. How much came out of that area?

18 MR. MACDONALD: You couldn't possibly set  
19 up a District Office just to deal with the volume we  
20 have here. We have tried.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: You mean if the whole  
22 twenty-seven hundred came out of Timmins it wouldn't  
23 justify a District Office?

24 MR. MACDONALD: You couldn't possibly  
25 justify it.

26 MR. ESTEY: That would be proven by the  
27 fact you have four thousand in Sudbury and Algoma to the  
28 west, but you situated the office in North Bay rather  
29 than Sudbury?

30 MR. MACDONALD: Purely because of the





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2723

1 facilities for travel that existed at that time. There  
2 has been a change in the highway network since then,  
3 but at that time the spot that had the greatest accessibility was North Bay.

4  
5 MR. ESTEY: But there would not be enough  
6 to run an office in Sudbury, with just the four thousand?  
7

8 MR. MACDONALD: We think no, not until we  
9 have six or seven thousand.

10 Under the heading of "Timmins Chest  
11 Examining Station", this office does not deal with en-  
12 quiries outside those dealing with miners' examinations  
13 and x-rays. Enquiries from the Timmins area are gener-  
14 ally made of the North Bay Office and where they cannot  
15 be dealt with promptly by telephone, personal visits  
16 are arranged.

17 The Rehabilitation Officer situated in  
18 the North Bay Office visits the Town of Timmins every  
19 second week. The District Manager from North Bay also  
20 visits Timmins, Kirkland Lake, Hearst, and Kapuskasing,  
21 on a regular basis.

22 During these visits, calls are made to  
23 the local hospitals, employers, unions, and civic offices  
24 if problems exist. In connection with the Town of Tim-  
25 mins, the Welfare Officer telephones the North Bay Office  
26 if he has problems between visits and they are resolved  
27 during discussions or by having the Rehabilitation  
28 Officer or other personnel from the North Bay Office  
29 visit Timmins. In case of an emergency, the staff will  
30 go to Timmins at any time.





Nethercut & Young

2724

Toronto, Ontario

1 Telex subscribers in the Timmins area can  
2 contact the Workmen's Compensation Board direct at its  
3 Toronto Office or via the North Bay Office at the same  
4 cost.

5 Under the heading "District Offices", the  
6 District Offices have evolved historically and the  
7 administration of these offices is expensive public  
8 relations. The Board can justify as economic district  
9 audit offices and district rehabilitation offices but  
10 the adjudication of claims is not improved by District  
11 Offices.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: How do they do it in  
13 England where they are all dealt with at the grass  
14 roots level?

15 MR. MACDONALD: Frankly, sir, I cannot  
16 comment on that. I am not knowledgeable about it. I  
17 think you will find though that professional people who  
18 have our type of problem, who have to make a decision  
19 based on evidence will make the decision centrally.  
20 They do not set up District Offices other than for in-  
21 formation gathering or sales offices, or doing a public  
22 function or perhaps a collection function.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly that is the  
24 case in this country at any rate.

25 MR. ESTEY: Is there a Rehabilitation  
26 Officer in all six of these Branch Offices?

27 MR. KERR: We have a Rehabilitation Of-  
28 ficer in Ottawa, Kitchener, Waterloo, Windsor, one at  
29 the Lakehead in Port Arthur, and two working out of  
30 North Bay. The answer would be yes.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2725

1 MR. ESTEY: One of whom would be in Sud-  
2 bury, so the answer would be yes?

3 MR. KERR: Yes.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: I have no further  
5 questions Mr. MacDonald.

6 MR. ESTEY: We have the individual briefs  
7 on matters of principle which we may now read into the  
8 record sir. The demolition briefs have been read in  
9 part, but it was agreed it better to put them all on  
10 the record again. I think A. & T. Wrecking was read  
11 in part and also completely.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Then it is not neces-  
13 sary to do it again.

14 MR. ESTEY: Pollett has only been refer-  
15 red to.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: A. & T., are you  
17 going to read A. & T.?

18 MR. GUTHRIE: I am fairly certain it has  
19 been read if not virtually in its entirety. A. & T. is  
20 the firm in Hamilton.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Complaining about the  
22 classification?

23 MR. GUTHRIE: Complaining for one thing  
24 about the fifteen percent rate on demolition firms  
25 being exorbitant.

26 MR. MACDONALD: I believe that brief was  
27 attached to my report on that particular point and it  
28 was read into the record.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

30 MR. GUTHRIE: The next is M. J. Pollett





Nethercut & Young

22, 1966

Toronto, Ontario

1 and that is a Kingston firm. The brief is dated Aug-  
2 ust 2nd, 1966, and reads:

3 "I am the sole proprietor of the business  
4 which bears my name. My son Robert Pol-  
5 lett is my foreman in conjunction with  
6 the demolition business. I also operate  
7 a lumber yard, both new lumber and build-  
8 ing materials are sold. When public  
9 meetings are held to discuss compensation  
10 we would like to be represented to state  
11 our views on the rates of assessments  
12 and the methods of arriving at the rates.  
13 and the operation of a new and used lum-  
14 ber yard.

15 "One rate of assessment for the entire  
16 business, we think for the demolition  
17 business is unrealistic and unfair. Rates  
18 of assessment should be based on three  
19 factors, (a) the locality where the work  
20 takes place, (b) the height of the build-  
21 ing being torn down and (c) the safety  
22 record of the demolition firm doing the  
23 work."

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Stop there. I think  
25 Mr. MacDonald said the Board had no statistical evidence  
26 to show that the locality or the height of the building  
27 being demolished had any effect on accident frequency  
28 in this industry, but I am not sure whether he said he  
29 knew one way or the other or was going to substantiate  
30 it.





Nethercut & Young

2727

Toronto, Ontario

1                   MR. MACDONALD: We have tested with a  
2 survey whether the height made any difference in con-  
3 struction going up or coming down, and the answer is  
4 it doesn't. Certainly there isn't any significant  
5 variation in districts. There would be the variations  
6 of luck, but not enough in a local situation which  
7 would be significant.

8                   MR. GUTHRIE: As to the safety record, do  
9 you recall whether the demolition business is on the  
10 merit plan?

11                  MR. MACDONALD: The point I made, Mr.  
12 Commissioner, the present rate and the fact there is  
13 a separate rate, is the result of the trade association.  
14 The only trade association that represents this total  
15 industry and we have this separate rate basically at  
16 their request.

17                  MR. GUTHRIE: Were they polled to go on  
18 the merit plan?

19                  MR. MACDONALD: As an additional factor,  
20 no.

21                  THE COMMISSIONER: They didn't go for  
22 the merit system?

23                  MR. MACDONALD: No, sir, they didn't.

24                  MR. GUTHRIE: The brief goes on, "the  
25 rates of the association would be higher in the larger  
26 cities where the risks are greater and the individual  
27 firm would support each firm to be safety conscious, in  
28 order to change from the latest rate. The unsafe or  
29 accident prone organization would soon be out of busi-  
30 ness and one of the reasons for the high rate would be





Nethercut & Young

720

Toronto, Ontario

removed. Attached is a schedule of the Workmen's Compensation Board assessment from 1959 to June 30th, 1966, which illustrates the following facts which speak for others as well as showing our safety record is good.

"1. The rise in rate of assessment from four point five percent to fifteen percent in 1966.

"2. What was assessed from 1959 to June 30th, 1966.

"3. The compensation paid the employees and paid by this firm in that same period

"4. Medical aid for the period.

"5. The total of compensation and medical aid for the period.

"6. The excess of the amounts paid by us over the amounts paid out by the Compensation Board to our employees from 1959 to 1966."

The brief concludes with mentioning a letter written to the Board stating these same views, and attaching the schedule for the period 1959 to 1966, which I think we have examined several times before, Mr. Commissioner. In the case of this firm it shows an excess of assessment over accident costs in 1959 of six hundred and sixty-seven dollars, rising by 1963 to thirty-five hundred odd dollars and in 1965 to thirty-seven hundred dollars and in 1966 up to June 30th, four thousand one hundred and ninety-two dollars and forty-one cents. The total for that period of seven years of assessments is twenty-one thousand odd dollars and the





Nethercut & Young

272

Toronto, Ontario

1 excess of their assessments over costs paid is sixteen  
2 thousand odd dollars.

3 Then we have the brief of Mr. Murdo Mar-  
4 tin referred to a moment ago. Are there copies Mr.  
5 Johnson?

6 THE COMMISSIONER: We can leave that un-  
7 til after lunch, Mr. Guthrie, and we will adjourn until  
8 2:00 P.M.

9 \*\*\*\*  
10

11  
12  
13 ---- The Commission adjourned  
14 until 2:00 P.M.  
15 \*\*\*\*  
16  
17  
18 MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Commissioner, I was  
19 going to begin the brief of Mr. Martin on Gold Miners'  
20 Chest Problems, but I see that Mr. Osler is here and  
21 maybe it would be convenient if he went ahead at this  
22 time.

23 MR. OSLER: Just as the Commission wishes.  
24 It will be on the rehabilitation section.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: I am quite willing.

26 MR. OSLER: I am here for the afternoon.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: We are in the process  
28 of reading material in so you can suit yourself.

29 MR. OSLER: I am at the Commissioner's  
30 personal pleasure.





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Then we will proceed  
2 in the present way. Mr. Osler can follow.

3 MR. GUTHRIE: The Martin brief reads:

4 "May I express my sincere appreciation  
5 for the opportunity to make a submission  
6 to this Commission set up to examine the  
7 Workmen's Compensation Board.

8 "The Brief is not a scientific document  
9 It is merely a layman's observations of  
10 conditions and problems which have come  
11 to my attention over many years. It is  
12 based on both my personal experience  
13 a gold miner and associations with gold  
14 miners for over thirty years. More par-  
15 ticularly it is based on the many hun-  
16 dreds of problems which have come to my  
17 attention in my duties as an M.P. for a  
18 gold mining area for the past ten years.

19 "It is true that Workmen's Compensation  
20 is a provincial matter and I am a federal  
21 M.P. but this does not alter the fact  
22 that I get an average of about fifteen  
23 compensation cases per week to deal with,  
24 which clearly is an indication of the  
25 severity of the problem. These range  
26 from simply giving advice or making out  
27 reports, to presenting appeals to the  
28 Appeal Tribunal and indeed to the Board  
29 itself.

30 "In accordance with the telephone con-





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2731

versation held yesterday, I am confining this Brief to the problems pertaining to chest conditions and I hope to bring certain other problems and suggestions to your notice at a future date.

"This Brief will deal with three main points. The adequacy of the term 'Industrial Diseases' as it pertains to gold miners. The adequacy of the detection of the disease silicosis at the present time, and finally the situation of actual silicosis pensioners who succumb from conditions other than the one for which they were receiving a pension.

"The problem of chest conditions or disabling conditions pertaining to the pulmonary tract is one which has plagued the mining industry and more particularly the gold mining industry throughout its history.

"It is rare indeed to find a gold miner who has worked more than twenty years underground or has been exposed to silica dust in the mill or crusher house, who does not suffer from the problem of short breath, pain and discomfort in the chest, excessive coughing, etc.

"It is all too familiar a pattern. My files are filled with the cases of gold miners in their early sixties, in their





Nethercut & Young

2732

Toronto, Ontario

1                   fifties and even quite a number in their  
2                   forties who are so seriously disabled  
3                   that they are prevented from earning  
4                   their living except in the lightest pos-  
5                   sible jobs, if and when such are avail-  
6                   able, and they receive no pension

7                   "It must be kept in mind that these men  
8                   cannot be considered to be average men.

9                   The Silicosis Act of Ontario, Section 2,  
10                  provides, with penalties for violation,  
11                  that 'no person shall be employed in an  
12                  industrial process involving a silica  
13                  exposure --- unless he is the holder of  
14                  a health certificate issued under the  
15                  Regulations'.

16                  "This clearly has eliminated from the  
17                  ranks of gold miners any man who might  
18                  have any pulmonary defect, present or  
19                  past. Furthermore, the law required  
20                  these men to be re-examined at least  
21                  yearly as long as they continue to work  
22                  under exposure to such silica dust. It  
23                  is obvious that these men are, and con-  
24                  tinue to be, in a very carefully selected  
25                  category.

26                  "Why, under such circumstances, do we  
27                  find so many of these picked men, who  
28                  should normally be in the prime of life,  
29                  to be instead mere shells of the men they  
30                  were just a few years before, to be





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2733

1 physically unable to earn their living  
2 and to be forced to fall back on the wel-  
3 -fare rolls of their municipalities.

4 "My submission is that the reasons are  
5 two-fold. First the definition of 'In-  
6 dustrial Diseases' as it pertains to  
7 gold miners is too restrictive. Secondly,  
8 the methods of detecting the disease  
9 silicosis as defined in the Workmen's  
10 Compensation Act are not adequate to cope  
11 with the problem.

12 "To my knowledge the only Industrial  
13 Diseases of gold miners recognized as  
14 compensable by the Workmen's Compensation  
15 Board are silicosis and pneumoconiosis.  
16 In recent years, through better ventila-  
17 tion methods in mining, and possibly  
18 through the process known as aluminum  
19 dust therapy, there has been a marked  
20 decline in the number of compensation  
21 claims established for these diseases.

22 "However, this has not been accompanied  
23 by a similar decline in the number of  
24 gold miners who have become partially or  
25 totally disabled as a result of chest  
26 ailments. Rightly or wrongly, the feel-  
27 ing is widespread throughout the gold  
28 mining communities that aluminium dust  
29 therapy, for example, has been more suc-  
30 cessful in hiding silicosis than in





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2734

1                   curing or preventing it.

2                   "The feeling is widespread that the many  
3                   diseases now being diagnosed as emphysema,  
4                   bronchitis, asthma, etc. and even carci-  
5                   noma of the lungs are caused by, or have  
6                   a definite relationship to, the damage  
7                   done to the pulmonary tract by exposure  
8                   to the dusts of the gold mining industry

9                   "I must frankly admit that I do not have  
10                  technical evidence or statistical data  
11                  to make an irrefutable case in this field.  
12                  Furthermore, I have neither the facilities  
13                  nor indeed the time to pursue this mat-  
14                  ter as I feel it should be pursued. I  
15                  can only relate the facts and describe  
16                  the situation as I have found it from  
17                  personal contact and observations

18                  "The symptoms of silicosis and pneumo-  
19                  coniosis are almost identical. The only  
20                  difference in their definition is that  
21                  silicosis is defined as resulting from  
22                  exposure to silica dust while pneumo-  
23                  coniosis results from exposure to dust.

24                  "In far too many cases, men have endeav-  
25                  oured for years to establish a silicosis  
26                  pension without success. Ashing of lung  
27                  tissue at post mortems, or in some cases  
28                  post mortem alone, has proven at last  
29                  that they did indeed suffer from silicosis;  
30                  in some cases advanced stages of silicosis."





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2735

1 THE COMMISSIONER: I wonder what he means  
2 by ashing of lung tissue. I understood that where  
3 silicosis occurs there was a sort of fibrotic condition  
4 that could be demonstrated. It could be demonstrated,  
5 if not detected earlier, it could be demonstrated by  
6 a post mortem but ashing, I wonder what that is.

7 MR. ESTEY: I presume that is a burning  
8 of the tissue under pressure but the silica wouldn't  
9 have burned.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: That may be. There  
11 is some evidence of silica dust in the lungs but there  
12 wasn't a fibrotic condition that came where the disease  
13 had started. Maybe we can find out from someone what  
14 the word "ashing" means.

15 "As you can see this imposes unfair and  
16 unwarranted deprivation, anxiety, and  
17 suffering on such workmen and their  
18 families.

19 "Whether existing methods of detection  
20 can be improved is a question only Medi-  
21 cal Science can answer. However, fail-  
22 ing any improvement in detection, the  
23 onus seems to be on the Workmen's Com-  
24 pensation Board to relax the strictness  
25 of present decisions and grant a greater  
26 degree of 'benefit of doubt' to such  
27 workmen.

28 "The families of past and present work-  
29 men who were or are receiving a pension  
30 for silicosis are faced with a serious





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2736

1 problem. If the death certificate of  
2 any such pensioner shows as the cause of  
3 death anything other than 'death due to  
4 silicosis', the family is cut off with-  
5 out a cent.

6 "This appears to be unfair for more than  
7 one reason. It leaves the family at the  
8 mercy of a possible typographical error  
9 in some doctor's office. It is a well  
10 known fact that most, if not all, of our  
11 doctors, are severely overworked and  
12 just do not have the time they themselves  
13 would like to devote to each case.

14 "Different doctors may make a different  
15 diagnosis of any given patient. I know  
16 and can supply evidence where one death  
17 was diagnosed by three different doctors  
18 as follows: 1. Carcinoma of the aeso-  
19 phagus; 2. Cerebral hemorrhage;  
20 3. Coronary thrombosis. In this case,  
21 a post mortem was carried out by special  
22 order of the deceased man and number  
23 three was confirmed as the actual cause  
24 of death.

25 "In most cases, however, no post mortem  
26 is carried out and this could lead to  
27 unintentional errors which could impose  
28 a lasting financial penalty on the family  
29 of the deceased pensioner.

30 "Last, but far from least, I have dis-





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2737

1 cussed this situation with many doctors  
2 and all agree that badly impaired or  
3 damaged lungs place a great stress on  
4 the heart and other vital organs, and  
5 there is a strong possibility that these  
6 over-taxed organs fail long before their  
7 normal time because of the industrial  
8 disease suffered by the pensioner.

9 "Unfortunately, there have been no stu-  
10 dies made in this field that I have been  
11 able to find. It would seem desirable  
12 that such a study be made, and pending  
13 decisive results of such study, that  
14 greater consideration be given to such  
15 cases.

16 "To sum up it would seem that in view of  
17 the numerous problems arising consist-  
18 ently in the gold mining industry that  
19 the following steps should be taken.

20 "1. Studies should be undertaken and  
21 steps taken to ensure that the present  
22 definition of industrial diseases as it  
23 pertains to gold miners is, in fact, ad-  
24 equate to cover and protect men in this  
25 industry.

26 "2. That if present methods of detecting  
27 the diseases silicosis and pneumonoconic-  
28 sis cannot be improved, steps be taken  
29 to give greater consideration to the  
30 'Benefit of doubt' clause to ensure





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2738

1 fairness to these workmen and avoid un-  
2 necessary financial privation to the  
3 families of men who eventually prove to  
4 be eligible for benefits.

"3. That greater consideration and study be given in cases where silicosis pensioners die from some ailment other than their compensable one. Thus, if it is reasonable, or logical to conclude that the fatal ailment could have been caused or hastened by the compensable disease from which the man suffered, then the family of the deceased pensioner shall continue to be covered.

"All of which is respectfully submitted."

MR. GUTHRIE: He would endorse the views  
of witnesses as to the need for such study  
, but he admits the evidence is lacking  
relationship with emphesyma and bronchitis  
er chest ailments. The man himself in  
es the point of the stress on the other  
body, and I think the Board told us it  
heart failure that was recognized as a  
silicosis, but no other organ was treated  
on, and the medical men felt there was not  
ink established in their science.

To proceed with the individual briefs,  
her, Elman W. Campbell, but perhaps be-  
I should have mentioned, Mr. Commissioner,  
A' to Mr. Martin's Brief is an individual





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2775

1 case of a diseased silicotic including correspondence.  
2 Because it was an individual claim I did not think it  
3 needed to be read into the record. Would you like me to  
4 deal with the case that is attached?

5 THE COMMISSIONER: The case that is attach-  
6 ed. I don't think you need do it. He refers to a case  
7 where the autopsy indicated there was silicosis, but there  
8 was no sign of this at his last examination in 1957, and  
9 his death was in 1960 or something or other.

10 MR. ESTEY: He was killed in an automobile  
11 accident.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: It does not indicate  
13 what had happened in the meantime. He may not have had  
14 any examination or been working in the mines or anything  
15 else. In the other case, it is hard to believe one could  
16 confuse carcinoma of the aesophagus with silicosis or  
17 pneumoconiosis when he died of coronary thrombosis.

18 MR. GUTHRIE: Then, if I might move to the  
19 Brief of Elman W. Campbell. This gentleman from Newmarket,  
20 I won't read the letter in full Mr. Commissioner, while a  
21 Chemical Engineer student at the University of Toronto  
22 took summer employment in 1928 with Dome Mines, and in an  
23 accident in that year he lost the vision of both eyes and  
24 since he is totally blind he receives a pension which  
25 originally was eighty-two dollars and fifty cents per  
26 month. This was raised in 1965 to one hundred and twenty-  
27 three dollars and seventy-five cents per month. The point  
28 he makes really begins in the penultimate paragraph on  
29 the first page where he states:

30 "I understand that pensions paid by the





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2740

1 Workmen's Compensation Board are based on  
2 assessments made by the Board on the vari-  
3 ous industries throughout the province, and  
4 this assessment in turn depends upon the  
5 amount of wages paid to workers in the in-  
6 dustry during the year the claim was made.  
7 In 1928 the average payroll of an industry  
8 was less than one-quarter of what it is  
9 today pro-rated over the same number of  
10 employees. Therefore the pension paid on  
11 any claim would be less than one-quarter of  
12 the pension paid for a similar claim incur-  
13 red in 1966."

14 I am not sure that follows. He goes on to  
15 say:

16 "There are probably very few workers in my  
17 category, and no one sufficiently interested  
18 to present their claim for additional con-  
19 sideration by the Board.

20 "A point for comparison is the Ontario  
21 Teacher's Federation. This is a strongly  
22 organized federation of educated men and  
23 women, who have been able throughout the  
24 years to make representation to the Ontario  
25 Government to have additional funds made  
26 available to the Federation to enable them  
27 to pay pensions in excess of the pension a  
28 teacher would have received in 1928. As  
29 the cost of living rose, so also did the  
30 superannuation pensions received by retired





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2741

1 members of the Teacher's Federation.

2 "If the Ontario Government can make addit-  
3 ional funds available commensurate to the  
4 cost of living for one group of workers,  
5 why can it not do likewise for another  
6 group, by making additional funds available  
7 to the Workmen's Compensation Board for dis-  
8 tribution among workers receiving pensions  
9 due to injuries received at a time when the  
10 cost of living was much less than it is to-  
11 day. I know that the decisions of the  
12 Board are final, but it appears very unfair  
13 to me that a person today receiving any  
14 given injury necessitating a pension for the  
15 rest of his life should receive several  
16 times more than another person who received  
17 a similar injury thirty-five to forty years  
18 ago. I believe that all pensions paid  
19 through the Workmen's Compensation Board  
20 should be based on the cost of living at  
21 all times."

22 Then the Brief of Mr. G. Charity. He writes  
23 from Quebec, June 25th, 1966. Again to move along into  
24 the letter, he tells us at age twenty-three in 1935, he  
25 was struck by a Coca Cola truck while painting guard posts  
26 on the side of the highway. As a result of that his left  
27 leg below the knee was shattered, both bones compound and  
28 the ankle was fractured. As a result, he was awarded  
29 twelve dollars and fifty cents a week on which he had to  
30 keep a family of four. After four years he could walk a





Nethercut & Young

27-2

Toronto, Ontario

1 short distance without crutches and the Board paid him  
2 off with four hundred dollars. On the second page he  
3 makes the point about the cost of living and Mr. Charity  
4 says:

5 "I have since tried to have the Board bring  
6 this pension up in line with today's stan-  
7 dards, but was flatly refused."

8 He then speaks of various attempts to have  
9 the Board's decision reviewed. He says he has taken sum-  
10 mer employment flying a bush aircraft and was then hurt  
11 in an aircraft two years ago, and has little hope of just  
12 treatment from the Board. He then speaks of the widow's  
13 pension of seventy-five dollars a month which he considers  
14 degrading in amount. He goes to the gold mining industry,  
15 which he is also familiar with, and finds a large percen-  
16 tage of the illness of miners are connected with silica  
17 dust, the result being he can hardly breathe and he says  
18 such cases are invariably diagnosed as either T.B. or  
19 emphysema, neither of which are pensionable by the Board.  
20 The only lung disease that is pensionable is silicosis,  
21 but strange as it may seem, these men with rock dust in  
22 their lungs never seem to have silicosis.

23 We have heard other evidence on that point,  
24 Mr. Commissioner. He goes on to say that the section of  
25 the act which was used so effectively by Coca Cola with  
26 the help of the Board, is if he remembers correctly Part  
27 I, Schedule 9, Subsection (5). He concludes by saying  
28 he may put his case in the form of a printed booklet. It  
29 is a wide ranging submission, Mr. Commissioner and it  
30 touches on the cost of living and the widow's pension.





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2742

1 THE COMMISSIONER: It might be what he is  
2 generally concerned with is --

3 MR. GUTHRIE: I tried to track down that  
4 reference he made to the statute and couldn't find any-  
5 thing related to his problems.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, he is obviously  
7 referring to the fact, I think, of Section 9, Subsection  
8 (6) of the Act.

9 MR. GUTHRIE: Which denies him the right  
10 to action against Coca Cola and denies him the right to  
11 go against anyone in Section 1.

12 Mr. Arthur L. Court, from Sault Ste. Marie,  
13 wrote to the Commission on July 5th. He has a number of  
14 suggestions but they are not all related to each other,  
15 but I might perhaps read them.

16 "There is a definite lack of information  
17 given to the employee concerning disability  
18 payments. The employee is allotted a mon-  
19 thly payment at the sole discretion of the  
20 Board who, in turn, refuse to relate the  
21 basis on which the employee is being paid.

22 "An employee receiving compensation payment  
23 of seventy-five percent of six thousand  
24 dollars, which is the maximum payment, is  
25 suffering a monetary loss when he is em-  
26 ployed in a high wage rate area such as  
27 Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, or Sarnia. For  
28 example, compensation should be seventy-  
29 five percent of the total of the previous  
30 months earnings.





Nethercut & Young

2744

Toronto, Ontario

1        "In the case of permanent disability, an  
2        employee should be paid the amount he would  
3        normally be entitled to earn had he not  
4        been disabled.

5        "There is a dire need for a third party to  
6        be involved when a dispute arises between  
7        the Board and the injured workman. As it  
8        stands now, the arbitrary position of the  
9        Board affords no other alternative to the  
10      workman involved.

11       "A workman with a permanent disability is  
12      at the mercy of the employer and if he is  
13      refused employment suitable to his condition,  
14      is then left to be dealt with by the Com-  
15      pensation Board

16       "The case of the injured employee returning  
17      to work prematurely on orders from the com-  
18      pany doctor should be investigated to the  
19      fullest extent. It appears that the policy  
20      of the company is to get an employee back  
21      on the payroll as soon as possible, to  
22      avoid compensation payment to the Boards.

23       "There seems to be a difference in daily  
24      living allowances issued by the Board for  
25      individuals who must stay in Toronto Hotels.  
26      All rates and information should be clearly  
27      stated in the letter sent to the employee  
28      prior to arrival in Toronto."

29       I think each of these might be said to be  
30      a different point, Mr. Commissioner.





Nethercut & Young

2745

Toronto, Ontario

1 THE COMMISSIONER: All of them have arisen  
2 with the exception of the one about the amounts, and I  
3 think we will consider that letter together with the  
4 other reports.

5 MR. GUTHRIE: Then we have Mr. Michael  
6 Dooley of Dundas.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: There was one point in  
8 that last submission on the lack of information re the  
9 basis of allowances. When an allowance is made, Mr. Kerr,  
10 does a letter state on what basis?

11 MR. KERR: No, it doesn't, sir, but if a  
12 worker inquires as to the basis of his pension we furnish  
13 that information.

14 MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Michael Dooley, of Dun-  
15 das, was injured in 1959 when he received a blow to his  
16 knee. The only treatment the doctor recommended, as far  
17 as I can read, was short-wave, and he didn't lose any  
18 time through the accident. However, the injury was  
19 aggravated to the point where surgery was needed and time  
20 was ultimately lost at the time of the surgery, I suppose  
21 in 1966 when he made his claim for compensation. His  
22 rate was taken from his first injury in 1959 which is,  
23 briefly, his complaint.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: This is Dooley?

25 MR. GUTHRIE: Michael Dooley.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: He was injured in 1959?

27 MR. GUTHRIE: With no lost time.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: But it was reported was  
29 it? Apparently it was. They accepted it -- the Board  
30 accepted it -- but whether it did or not the compensation





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

1 is based in 1959, though he had to give up work in what  
2 year?

3 MR. GUTHRIE: January of this year.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: He gave up work in 1966  
5 but the pension was based on the earnings in the prior  
6 twelve months or four months prior to the accident in 1959.  
7 Let us look at that section. What is the section, Mr.  
8 Kerr?

9 MR. KERR: Section 48.

10 MR. ESTEY: On Page 20.

11 MR. COMMISSIONER: Forty-eight.

12 MR. KERR: Where a workman has been awarded  
13 compensation for permanent disability and returned to em-  
14 ployment he is entitled to, he shall be paid on either  
15 the average weekly earnings as of the date of the accident,  
16 or the average weekly earnings at the date of recurrence.

17 MR. COMMISSIONER: In other words, if he  
18 was awarded at this time, in 1959, some compensation for  
19 permanent disability and returned to work, and then in  
20 1966 the Board could have allowed his compensation on the  
21 basis of his earnings immediately prior to ceasing work  
22 in 1966. That is if he had a permanent disability in the  
23 first place. But he didn't. He kept on working so am I  
24 correct in this -- in the case of just a partial dis-  
25 ability, with no permanency award in 1959, and he finally  
26 has to by reason of a recurrence, has to give up work in  
27 1966, there is nothing in the Act to allow you to treat it  
28 in the same way as when there is a permanent disability?

29 MR. KERR: In the absence of permanent dis-  
30 ability we must base the compensation on the pre-accident





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

1 earnings. If he had received a permanent disability, or  
2 as a result of his treatment now we knew he would receive  
3 a permanent disability in the future, if either of those  
4 conditions were present we could base his compensation on  
5 his recent earnings if greater than the pre-accident earn-  
6 ings.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Where there is permanent  
8 disability it is plain. Where is the section that you  
9 act under when you give disability allowance in 1966?

10 MR. KERR: I don't quite follow that, sir.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: He gets an allowance in  
12 1966. A permanent disability allowance, but it is based  
13 upon his pre 1959 earnings, is that right?

14 MR. KERR: That is right sir.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Where do we find out the  
16 section under which we give him compensation for his per-  
17 manent disability in 1966?

18 MR. KERR: Under Section 42.

19 MR. GUTHRIE: And that refers you back to  
20 Section 40.

21 MR. KERR: His permanent disability would be  
22 on his pre-existent earnings, but his temporary compen-  
23 sation would be based on his current earnings as total  
24 disability has been, or will be awarded in the future.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: So Section 42 refers you  
26 back to Section 40 and Section 40 says that temporary dis-  
27 ability results from the injury and compensation shall be  
28 paid on seventy-five percent of the weekly earnings during  
29 previous the twelve months/ In other words, "previously injured," you  
30 interpret in Section 42, which refers to Section 40, which





Nethercut & Young

2748

Toronto, Ontario

1 states it must be to the previous twelve months.

2 MR. KERR: His permanent disability award.

3 MR. GUTHRIE: You take the word "injury" to  
4 be the injury in 1959?

5 MR. KERR: There is only one injury, the  
6 other is a recurrence. If there were a further injury  
7 there would probably be set up a new claim and a new  
8 accident, but in this case he is talking a straight re-  
9 currence of his injury, which took place in 1959 and there  
10 was no lost time until January, 1966, so it is under one  
11 claim.

12 MR. ESTEY: You mean there wasn't any new  
13 physical contact?

14 MR. KERR: That is right, sir, and what he  
15 is saying is that in the lost time in 1966, we based his  
16 compensation prior to the accident in February 1959,  
17 which is correct. The only exception we can make is if  
18 he had a permanent disability award, or is to receive one  
19 in the future. This Section 40 (a) comes into play but  
20 it only applies to this section where permanent disability  
21 is involved or will be involved.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Well, we will  
23 have to take a look at that one.

24 MR. GUTHRIE: Mrs. Harriet King, of London,  
25 has a brief letter.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: It seems to me that in  
27 any event the necessity of making that interpretation  
28 doesn't furnish any great incentive for a man to return  
29 to work, and working as long as he can after the accident.

30 MR. GUTHRIE: Mrs. Harriet King has a short





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

241

1 letter to you from London, dated June 20th, 1966. Mrs.  
2 King is a widow with four children whose husband was  
3 killed while at work. She makes two points, the pension  
4 she finds very inadequate and secondly the Compensation  
5 Board should pay for the Ontario Hospitalization Insurance,  
6 as she is unable to do so.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Is she suggesting it  
8 should be in addition to her pension?

9 MR. GUTHRIE: I would take it that is her  
10 idea, Mr. Commissioner, but apart from that altogether,  
11 I would think the principle point is the amount of the  
12 widow's benefit. We have seen that it doesn't seem to  
13 have arisen at the same rate as the orphan's pension.

14 Then we have a letter from Mrs. Hilda Lewis  
15 from South Porcupine, who writes on behalf of her husband  
16 who was injured at the Pamour Porcupine Mine in 1938, at  
17 a time when his hourly rate was fifty-two cents an hour.  
18 He was awarded a pension of forty dollars a month and that  
19 must have been a permanent partial award, I think, because  
20 he did resume his duties as well as he could, until March  
21 of 1960 when he became permanently disabled. I beg your  
22 pardon, this letter is not clear. He did continue working  
23 until March of 1960, at age fifty-five and finally in  
24 October, 1963, he was permanently disabled and could not  
25 work. In 1961 his pension was increased to fifty-one  
26 dollars and twenty-five cents and in 1965 to eighty dollars.  
27 Coming to the third page of the letter, she says:

28 "We are hoping a recommendation can be made  
29 that when a man is permanently disabled  
30 that his pension will then be based on his





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

750

rate of pay on his last day of work."

2 THE COMMISSIONER: This is the same problem  
3 we have just been discussing.

4 MR. GUTHRIE: She goes on to say her husband  
5 has arthritis and also Parkinson's Disease and she makes  
6 the point that the Board apparently does not recognize  
7 nervous disorders, although the Honourable Mr. Rowntree  
8 was supposed to have mentioned nervous disorders arising  
9 out of accidents may be brought into the Act, but she does  
10 not think anything was done about it.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: We have heard the medical  
12 staff of the Board are keeping up with the science, and  
13 it recognizes nervous disorders in certain cases.

14 MR. GUTHRIE: Now we have a letter from  
15 Robert J. McKinstry. He says he does not want to burden  
16 you with his troubles but he asks the question as to  
17 whether the present pensions paid to disabled workmen will  
18 be discussed but he makes no recommendation.

I beg your pardon, Mr. Commissioner, a subsequent letter was received by the Secretary from this same gentleman only this month. He states, " it is not possible for me to attend in person," but due to his injury he is making less money now than in 1959 when he was first injured, and this includes his pension of twenty five dollars a month. He goes on to say, " I also asked for training in some other line of work, but was refused. I had some training as a bookkeeper but not enough to obtain a position in that line. I thought it reasonable to ask for more training in this line but evidently the Board thought otherwise." He states if his wife was not





Nethercut & Young

7751

Toronto, Ontario

1 working he could not exist on his earnings.

2 We don't know much about his accident, but  
3 we hear he was refused retraining as a bookkeeper. Un-  
4 fortunately we really have not any facts to go on, we have  
5 no claim number. Have you any recollection Mr. Kerr?

6 MR. KERR: I have not, Mr. Guthrie, but if  
7 Mr. McKinstry would contact me I would be delighted to  
8 have his file reviewed, and do anything we could for him  
9 in the retraining field. We would be delighted to look  
10 at it.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Is this the result of the  
12 fact he hasn't gone through review and on to appeal. I  
13 take it that is it, Mr. Kerr?

14 MR. KERR: I don't know what his problem is,  
15 sir, except he has been refused training.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you review cases that  
17 have gone on right through, like Mr. Pifer's?

18 MR. KERR: I don't personally, sir.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Will the Board accept  
20 cases?

21 MR. KERR: On the appeal procedures, yes.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: After the appeal procedure  
23 is finished?

24 MR. KERR: I don't know if this man has gone  
25 through the appeal procedure, sir.

26 MR. GUTHRIE: We might advise Mr. McKinstry  
27 that he could take the matter up with Mr. Kerr.

28 MR. KERR: Whatever is your desire.

29 MR. GUTHRIE: There doesn't seem much else  
30 we can do for him.





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1966

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, no, but I wonder  
2 if -- I suppose there isn't much you can tell him. You  
3 are now down to Rice are you?

4 MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Morton I will refer to  
5 briefly, Dr. Fee and Mr. Barker gave us the particulars  
6 of that claim last week, and I don't think we need read  
7 the brief.

8 Pifer we have dealt with, Neptune Meters  
9 was read into the record two weeks ago, and Pollett we  
10 have dealt with this morning.

11 Mr. Mel Rice of Sault Ste. Marie, submitted  
12 a brief on September 29th, 1966. It reads:

13 "I would like to present a brief to you on  
14 the Compensation Act particularly Articles  
15 40, 41 and 42. In order to do this in the  
16 best way I know how, I will have to use my  
17 case although this involves many more people  
18 than just myself.

19 "On September 8th, 1966, I was examined by  
20 Dr. Hogarth from the Compensation Board. We  
21 had quite a lengthy discussion about perma-  
22 nent loss of wages. It is with his sugges-  
23 tion and challenge that I am writing this.  
24 He told me of your Commission and its pur-  
25 pose and stated, 'if you don't like the  
26 Compensation Act as it now reads, change it'  
27 I have a large permanent loss of wages which  
28 he agrees does not seem fair, but which the  
29 Board cannot do a thing about as the present  
30 law reads. Even if this requested change





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

17-2

1 does not help me, perhaps it will protect  
2 workers of the future who get involved in  
3 similar circumstances.

4 "On January 14th, 1958, I was injured at  
5 work. I spent a short time in the hospital  
6 and at home and returned to work. As time  
7 progressed, my injury became worse. Approx-  
8 imately two years later I started having  
9 operations, after each one, I returned to  
10 work."

11 He goes on to say, "in 1962," and this was  
12 four years later, "my knee was fused. Upon  
13 my return to work the company said I could  
14 no longer do my work due to my disability.  
15 This I was forced to accept and take a les-  
16 ser job. My loss of wages was great between  
17 then and 1961, but not so great between then  
18 and 1958.

19 "In 1961 my average wage was two hundred and  
20 twenty-seven dollars per week. My average  
21 wage in 1958 as previous to the accident  
22 was one hundred and fifteen dollars per  
23 week. The wages on the lesser job in 1958  
24 was eighty-five dollars per week. On this  
25 same job in 1962 was one hundred and sixty  
26 cents per week. My original job was the  
27 highest paid job in the plant where I work.

28 "The Compensation Act now is interpreted  
29 loss of wages can be paid on a temporary  
30 disability but not on a permanent disability.





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

Q. 31

In other words, if I have take a lesser job temporarily, the Compensation Act will pay me seventy-five percent of my loss of wages, but if I have to take a lesser job on a permanent basis, I am not entitled to any loss of wages. I am only entitled to my clinical rating disability which in my case is twenty percent of three thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars or sixty-two dollars and fifty cents per month.

"My understanding of Compensation is that it is to provide the worker with funds to see that he can maintain to a degree a way of life that he is able to earn when an injury occurs. This should hold true just as much on a permanent basis as a temporary basis.

"Over the past few years, I have talked with quite a few different people at the Compensation Board, Rehabilitation Centre, and my personal physician. They all agree morally this isn't right but their hands are tied by these articles to do any different. Therefore, I would like to request a change in this section of the law to protect a permanently injured worker against loss of wages to the amount stated by the Compensation Act."

THE COMMISSIONER: This is not the same case as the other?

MR. GUTHRIE: I thought it was going to be





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

10155

1 as I began it.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Here is a man who has  
3 an injury and takes a lesser job. If he has a temporary  
4 disability they will pay him the difference between, or  
5 pay his employer to bring him from the pay he gets, when  
6 he goes back to work, up to his regular pay.

7 MR. GUTHRIE: They will pay him seventy-five  
8 percent of his wage loss.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: And then the time comes  
10 to turn it into a permanent loss. It is not based on  
11 what he was earning at the time he suffered the injury,  
12 but on his subsequent earnings.

13 MR. ESTEY: On his capacity to work. He  
14 is objecting to the standpoint that "41" doesn't apply  
15 to 40 and 42; "41" being temporary and not the difference  
16 in actual loss.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: This isn't as simple as  
18 that. Just let me renew the facts here again. He had  
19 an accident in 1958 and the injury gradually became worse.  
20 He was told he could no longer do his work and was forced  
21 to accept and do a lesser job. He worked on the lesser  
22 job. Then eventually he had to give up work, didn't he?

23 MR. GUTHRIE: He never says that.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: He never gave up work?

25 MR. ESTEY: No, he continued at the lower  
26 level.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: They eventually put him  
28 on a permanent basis?

29 MR. GUTHRIE: A permanent partial disability  
30 pension, based on his rate on the basis of his physical





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2756

1 impairment.

2 MR. ESTEY: It wouldn't make any difference  
3 to the job at that time. That is his complaint. He says,  
4 "if I worked under "41" that would be the base on my re-  
5 turn, but now with a permanent disability it is on my  
6 physical incapacity it is based."

7 THE COMMISSIONER: In other words, based on  
8 his physical incapacity, but you think that his physical  
9 capacity would bear some relation to the difference be-  
10 tween what he is earning on the two occasions?

11 MR. ESTEY: I am surprised now that he has  
12 explained it to us that it doesn't happen more often.  
13 Under Section 40 he goes to three-quarters of his average  
14 weekly earnings for temporary total. Under temporary  
15 partial you take seventy-five percent of his actual loss.  
16 Then he moved to permanent disability and you go back to  
17 Section 40, temporary partial and seventy-five percent of  
18 his partial earnings, and he said, "I do better under the  
19 temporary total because the actual economic loss is the  
20 base of my compensation, but if you put me on three-  
21 quarters it is three-quarters of what I am earning." It  
22 is a wonder it hasn't happened more often.

23 . THE COMMISSIONER: Have you any comment,  
24 Mr. Kerr?

25 MR. KERR: What the man says is true in  
26 this case. I assume he said twenty percent of a fixed  
27 thing and that would be taken right from our rate sched-  
28 ules of impairment. He could have a wage loss on twenty  
29 percent disability.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Now the other case you





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2757

1 deal with, where the man has a permanent disability and  
2 later an aggravation, you are entitled to assess it on  
3 the basis of what his original salary was. In this case,  
4 why wouldn't the same thing apply? It is a case of chang-  
5 ing a permanent disability account, isn't it? It is the  
6 case of assessing it for the first time, so you base it  
7 on the rate schedule?

8 MR. KERR: We also have cases on the rate  
9 schedule where a man makes more than he did before the  
10 accident. The man who is able to make more than he did  
11 before the accident would still have received the twenty  
12 percent. We have cases where a man can make more rather  
13 than less.

14 MR. GUTHRIE: There is a brief in the form  
15 of a letter from Albert V. Walker, of Oshawa, who is a  
16 member of the Provincial Legislature, dealing with light  
17 work, Mr. Commissioner. It reads:

18 "I would appreciate very much the oppor-  
19 tunity of placing before you for consider-  
20 ation during your review of the Workmen's  
21 Compensation Act, one of the more difficult  
22 problems with which I have been confronted  
23 in regard to Workmen's Compensation claims.

24 "One of the most difficult situations is  
25 the problem of the worker who is considered  
26 by the medical authorities of the Board to  
27 be 'fit for light work', his compensation  
28 payments are considerably reduced and he is  
29 literally sent out into the world to find a  
30 light job. It seems that this situation





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2750

- 1 usually occurs in the smaller industry  
2 where every workman is expected to carry  
3 his share of the load and pay for himself.  
4 This small industry just doesn't have any  
5 light work jobs and there is no regulation  
6 under the Workmen's Compensation Act which  
7 can force the employer to find light work  
8 for his injured employee, even though the  
9 unfortunate employee may have been injured  
10 by an accident which was no fault of his  
11 own.
- 12 "This is an area which can cause grave  
13 financial difficulties for the worker. The  
14 rehabilitation officers of the Workmen's  
15 Compensation Board try to assist this  
16 classification of worker to secure employ-  
17 ment, but there are few employers who will  
18 originally hire a man who is classified as  
19 only able to do light work.
- 20 "The question may well be asked, if the em-  
21 ployee is injured, especially if it be  
22 through no fault of his own, why shouldn't  
23 the employer be responsible for the welfare  
24 of his employee, either through full com-  
25 pensation payments until completely recov-  
26 ered, or the provision of a suitable light  
27 work job until he is medically fit to  
28 return to his original work?"
- 29 "I have discussed this problem at length  
30 with Board officials on various occasions





Nethercut & Young

2750

Toronto, Ontario

1 and they recognize these situations as  
2 being very complex. Certainly this type  
3 of situation can cause considerable hard-  
4 ship to the worker and his family who find  
5 themselves in an embarrassing financial  
6 position. I fully realize there is no  
7 easy solution to the problem which I have  
8 presented."

9 That also, Mr. Commissioner, is a matter  
10 we have had discussed on many occasions in these proceed-  
11 ings.

12 That ends the individual submissions that  
13 were not presented by the applicants in person.

14 MR. ESTEY: We have one more individual  
15 brief. Mr. Ostrowski, of Huntsville, was before the  
16 Commission previously in connection with medical matters.  
17 He has filed today Part II of his submission. Mr. Ostro-  
18 skie is present this afternoon, Mr. Commissioner, and is  
19 desirous of presenting this supplementary brief to the  
20 Royal Commission.

21 MR. JAN OSTROWSKI: I would like to express  
22 my thanks for permission to appear and to present other  
23 remarks additionally to you. This is in addition to the  
24 brief presented on the 26th.

25 The first point is under the heading,  
26 "right of choice of physician." I am sorry for the mis-  
27 take made in grammar but it was typed recently and I have  
28 corrected it only on my copy. This, in most of the cases,  
29 is a practical necessity accepted by the Board. Never-  
30 theless the Board retain full right to determine who





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1760

1 shall provide the treatment to those workmen, who are the  
2 Board's responsibility.

3 This right is exercised unilaterally not  
4 only in providing first aid, whenever feasible, but par-  
5 ticularly whenever the necessity of specialized medical  
6 services occur. It would be to the great advantage of  
7 both parties, both the Board and injured workman, if the  
8 workman and his family doctor would have the choice of  
9 specialists. This will give more confidence of receiving  
10 treatment on an equal basis with other patients, and will  
11 also eliminate the Board from all complaints for provid-  
12 ing unsatisfactory service.

13 As I mentioned in the last sentence of to-  
14 day's brief, these remarks are only examples of our ex-  
15 perience in dealing with the Workmen's Compensation Board,  
16 and the disaster which fell on Mrs. Ostrowski -- if we  
17 had had the choice of a physician. I don't want to go  
18 into details but they are apparently in the copy of the  
19 appeal which is annexed to the brief.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Now, I understand the  
21 practice is that you are allowed the choice of your own  
22 physician and that that physician is allowed to carry  
23 out the treatment up to a point, in any event?

24 MR. OSTROWSKI: Yes.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: It is the practice of  
26 the Board to let him carry out the treatment?

27 MR. OSTROWSKI: Yes, if it is not serious,  
28 but if a specialist's service is required --

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Then they give you a  
30 choice of two or three and you are restricted to those?





Nethercut & Young

2761

Toronto, Ontario

1                           MR. OSTROWSKI: Never. We are always  
2 assigned one doctor. In the first accident in 1952, and  
3 in 1954 Dr. A.W. White performed the surgery. My wife  
4 was directed straight to Dr. White and no one was even  
5 thinking some other doctor could do it. We have no com-  
6 plaint about Dr. White's medical performance, but when  
7 the occurrence was in 1963, Mrs. Ostrowski was also re-  
8 ferred straight to Dr. Lotto. No mention of any doctor  
9 or any choice. You just go to Dr. Lotto and Dr. Lotto  
10 will observe and operate eventually. There is no mention  
11 in any letter we received, in any correspondence, to say  
12 if you wish another doctor you can ask the Compensation  
13 Board for permission.

14                           The second point is dealing with lack of  
15 rehabilitation for injured female workers. The Workmen's  
16 Compensation Board operates a large, modern rehabilitation  
17 centre at Downsview. Despite the fact that women compose  
18 a very substantial part of the labour force in Canada,  
19 there is no rehabilitation centre for injured women.  
20 Downsview cares only for injured male workers. There is  
21 also no vocational and retraining unit for partly dis-  
22 abled workmen, men and women, which could provide them  
23 with new skills according to their post-accident possi-  
24 bilities. It is a fact that many many complications arise  
25 from that simple fact, that a workman is released too early,  
26 or left by himself to heal after the surgery. Something  
27 should be established fit for to deal with special kinds  
28 of injuries.

29                           The third point is the stability of pen-  
30 sions. The pension is based on the average wages at the





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2752

1 time of the accident. The pension of permanently disabled  
2 workmen remains one of the existing injustices. Although  
3 some of the most conspicuous examples of injustice to the  
4 old timers has been eliminated by most recent amendments  
5 and regulations, nevertheless the principle remains.  
6 There is no reason or necessity in present times, when  
7 nation's aim is to achieve maximum of social justice and  
8 security, to continue this injustice. Compensation for  
9 permanently disabled should be flexible in accordance  
10 with constantly rising costs of living, wages, allowances  
11 etc. Why those who suffered more should be left out of  
12 benefits enjoyed by the rest of the society? I think  
13 why is it workmen should be in a worse position than  
14 someone likely enough to reach the ripe old age which  
15 means he gets his pension increased by the rising cost  
16 of living, but the workmen will be left like in my wife's  
17 case, with the complications in 1963, and she will get  
18 still five dollars and twenty-five cents monthly pension.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: You are not suggesting,  
20 or are you suggesting that today's employers should be  
21 made responsible for yesterday's injury, or do you feel  
22 it should come out of the consolidated fund?

23 MR. OSTROWSKI: I am not suggesting the  
24 employer would be responsible. But there are many ways  
25 that such an injustice could be dealt with and I think  
26 that should be one of the main considerations for every-  
27 one interested.

28 Another point, No. 4, is the bureaucracy.  
29 The attached copy of the appeal illustrates the bureau-  
30 cracy and other deficiencies in functioning of the Board.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2763

1 The apparent politeness and smoothness in dealing with  
2 parties conceal very often serious deficiencies, more  
3 serious still when the health, well-being, future and pos-  
4 sibly the life of the workman is at stake. It must be  
5 really wrong when it takes four days to get an injured  
6 workman to the operating room, while proper treatment re-  
7 quires the surgery to be performed within twenty-four hours.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: That is a general state-  
9 ment that you make.

10 MR. OSTROWSKI: I can prove that case Your  
11 Lordship.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: We all know the difficulty  
13 of getting into hospitals today, but in any case of an em-  
14 ergency, is there any place unless very far removed, in  
15 the farther parts of Canada, where you can't get to hos-  
16 pital in twenty-four hours?

17 MR. OSTROWSKI: Your Lordship I would explain  
18 what we have in mind, with your permission. The accident  
19 occurred in early afternoon hours of December 11th, 1952.  
20 By the time when Dr. Gallagher arrived to take Mrs. Os-  
21 trowski to the hospital, for x-ray, and decided the case  
22 too complicated for the Huntsville hospital, he got in  
23 touch with the Compensation Board. There was no one to  
24 say if Mrs. Ostrowski was under compensation or not, so  
25 they were not dealing until the next morning. The next  
26 morning several calls were made. These calls finally ended  
27 with the statement that yes, Mrs. Ostrowski is under Com-  
28 pensation Board and we are sending ambulance to take her  
29 to Toronto.

30 The ambulance came next day, but not from





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2764

1      Toronto. Local ambulance take her by order of the Com-  
2      pensation Board to Toronto. Already this is fourty-eight  
3      hours. Two days in hospital -- there was room in hospital  
4      -- but two days elapsed between the admittance to the hos-  
5      pital and the operation itself. Altogether four days. I  
6      can prove that.

7                    THE COMMISSIONER: As far as those two days  
8      in the hospital were concerned, I suppose it depended up-  
9      on a surgeon to do the operation?

10                  MR. OSTROWSKI: Surgeon right on the spot.  
11      Maybe he was busy, I can't tell you that, but it was four  
12     days instead of twenty-four hours, and I don't think there  
13     is any reason in case of emergency when local doctor phones  
14     Compensation Board to refuse to send ambulance, because  
15     there is no such a great amount of money involved, that  
16     workman or his employer would not be responsible for it.  
17     But because we have no files, because I don't know if  
18     somebody insured, that takes too much responsibility on  
19     Compensation Board. I think it is an example of bureau-  
20     cracy.

21                  THE COMMISSIONER: This is one of the things  
22      we heard this morning, the complaint that the Board accepts  
23      these medical bills without checking to see whether they  
24      are responsible for them, because they are of relatively  
25      small amounts. The objection to their course of action  
26      is by so doing they more or less admit responsibility, and  
27      consequently claims are made and they are in the position  
28      of having admitted the responsibility originally.

29                  MR. OSTROWSKI: I don't know that is admit-  
30      ting responsibility, Your Lordship.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

1 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't either, but that  
2 was an objection.

3 MR. OSTROWSKI: In our case it was entirely  
4 different. The next point is "C" when there is evident  
5 lack of control over the quality of medical services pro-  
6 vided by the Board.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Contrary to the various  
8 things we have heard, I would have thought the type of  
9 medical services provided by the Board is of a pretty high  
10 order. They provide the best and most qualified special-  
11 ists in the field. They have a pretty good working ar-  
12 rangement with the medical profession. There is little  
13 criticism from the medical profession that they do not  
14 use their services to the best advantage. What is the  
15 basis for this statement, Mr. Ostrowski?

16 MR. OSTROWSKI: With your permission, Your  
17 Lordship, I will read part of Mrs. Ostrowski's appeal,  
18 which is attached to the brief,--because that is what sub-  
19 stantiated our claim: "This operation was performed in  
20 October 1963. This operation made me completely crippled,  
21 unable to move even a short distance with the help of two  
22 canes. Furthermore, after almost six months in hospitals  
23 I was discharged on March 10th, 1964, with non-united  
24 osteotomy, as fit to gradually resume my regular work and  
25 assurance that I will be completely fit to my regular work,  
26 as a cook and other duties for the summer of 1964.

27 "During the treatment in hospital I com-  
28 plained many times to Dr. Lotto about my condition and de-  
29 formities created by his operation and requested several  
30 times for another surgery to correct the deformities. All





Nethercut & Young

2766

Toronto, Ontario

1 my complaints and requests were entirely ignored and even  
2 ridiculed, by assuring me that "everything is alright"  
3 that all deformities exist in my mind or imagination, that  
4 they will disappear etc. It has to be made clear, that  
5 during the period between September 29th, 1963 and March  
6 10th, 1964, I was seen by several other doctors, Dr. Wright,  
7 Wylie, Crawford and also by Dr. White, all highly qualified  
8 specialists. Each one, even by looking at my hip, was  
9 fully aware of all deformities created by Dr. Lotto's  
10 surgery, but not one of them tried to warn me about my  
11 condition, do anything about them or even suggest consul-  
12 tation or further surgical treatment.

13                 "This fact compelled me to look for opinion  
14 and advice in New York. Only due to my own endeavours I  
15 have discovered the truth about my condition, so carefully  
16 concealed for more than seven months.

17                 "I am aware now, that the McMurray osteotomy  
18 may not always (fifteen - twenty percent) bring beneficial  
19 results, and some unlucky patients have to accept lack of  
20 improvement. I am also aware, that this surgery if pro-  
21 perly performed never brings worsening of the patient  
22 condition, never is followed by these kind of deformities.  
23 The truth I had to face was that instead of help and rel-  
24 ief, I was sent home by Dr. Lotto, first with non-united  
25 osteotomy. Secondly, with the spline loose in the greater  
26 trochanter. Thirdly, with movement on the site of the  
27 osteotomy. Fourthly, ninety degrees varus deformity.  
28 Fifthly, fourty-five degrees external rotation deformity  
29 of the distal fragment of the femur. Sixthly, thirty de-  
30 grees fixed flexion contracture deformity. Seventhly,





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

3767

1 five cm. shortening of my left leg. Eighthly, limitation  
2 of all movements of my left leg. Ninthly, increasing pain  
3 in lumbar region and right leg.

4 "On May 29th, 1964, I was advised about an  
5 appointment with Dr. Lotto, arranged for June 29th, 1964.  
6 The same day I mailed to the Board the following letter:

7 "Today I received your letter of May 27th,  
8 1964 with a transportation warrant dated  
9 May 28th attached.

10 "This is to inform you that I do not wish to  
11 have any further medical attention from Dr.  
12 W.N. Lotto. I have no confidence in him and  
13 therefore there is no point to report on  
14 June 29th.

15 "I do not feel it will be proper to discuss  
16 in strictly routine correspondence the rea-  
17 sons which led me to this unpleasant con-  
18 clusion, but I will take the first approp-  
19 priate opportunity to present them to the  
20 authorities of the Workmen's Compensation  
21 Board. Physical condition of my injury are  
22 now much worse than before the operation of  
23 October 1st, 1963, and I am unable to travel  
24 alone. Unfortunately the date of June 29th  
25 is too late for my husband to drive or to  
26 accompany me to Toronto. The tourist season  
27 commences on June 26th, and therefore I ask  
28 for an appointment at an earlier date.  
29 "I am returning the attached transportation  
30 warrant.





Nethercut & Young

2768

Toronto, Ontario

1           " " Despite my declaration of readiness to dis-  
2           close in appropriate way the reasons for this  
3           unpleasant decision, I was never called or  
4           asked about it by any official of the W.C.B.,  
5           and not even examined. Instead, following  
6           some behind the scene manipulation, my hus-  
7           band received from Dr. Harris the following  
8           letter:

9           " " I have now heard from the Compensation  
10          Board that they are willing to have me look  
11          after your wife.

12          " " Would you please let me know when you would  
13          like her to come down to have the surgery  
14          done. If you wish to leave this until after  
15          the summer season, I should put her name on  
16          the admission list now, as reservations are  
17          running about four months behind. If you  
18          would prefer to go ahead sooner, we can  
19          arrange to declare her an 'urgent' case,  
20          and try to get her in within the next few  
21          weeks. " "

22          " Following my husband's personal intervention  
23          with the Board on June 16th, 1964, the assignment of my  
24          case to Dr. Harris has been confirmed -- still without any  
25          medical examination and without any interest from the Board  
26          regarding the event which led to the necessity of correc-  
27          tive surgery.

28          " Corrective surgery performed by Dr. W.R.  
29          Harris on July 15th, 1964, was only partly successful,  
30          reducing the shortening of my left leg to thirty mm.,





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2769

1 external rotation of the shaft to fifteen degrees, restor-  
2 ing the valgus position with abduction deformity and leav-  
3 ing the fixed flexion deformity at thirty degrees unchanged."

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Now, Mr. Ostrowski, you  
5 go on another two paragraphs. Your complaint is that you  
6 did not get the proper medical attention. That the medi-  
7 cal attention given you wasn't successful. You don't feel  
8 these doctors were competent.

9 MR. OSTROWSKI: Your Lordship, I am com-  
10 plaining that the Workmen's Compensation Board do not pay  
11 any attention to what kind of medical service is given by  
12 the doctors provided by them. They do not even want to  
13 discuss the question. They just drop the file and refer  
14 to the medical department, to the other department about  
15 use and so on.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: If there were none known  
17 when she left the hospital, there would be a substantial  
18 time before they found out there would be a deformity or  
19 not.

20 MR. OSTROWSKI: The deformity was present  
21 from the first day of her operation, when she came from  
22 the operating table all the deformities were present.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: I think we will adjourn  
24 for a few minutes and hear the rest of the submission  
25 after that time.

26 \*\*\*\*  
27

28 --- The hearing recessed for  
ten minutes.  
29 \*\*\*\*  
30





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2770

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Now, Mr. Ostrowski, we  
2 are going to your number "D"?

3 MR. OSTROWSKI: When the Board, making a  
4 lump sum payment, advises that this is being done because  
5 the percentage of permanent disability is not expected to  
6 increase, and then in following few months a serious sur-  
7 gery is necessary.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: I thought the Board never  
9 made a lump sum settlement when the disability was over  
10 ten percent?

11 MR. OSTROWSKI: I was advised when the pen-  
12 sion is made below fifteen dollars and when there is no  
13 expectation of increasing the condition. That was in  
14 1962, and the next three or four or five months it was  
15 surgery was necessary. I think something is wrong in  
16 medical department as they knew perfectly all we know,  
17 from a study of a little bit of medical books that it was  
18 wrong. It could not develop otherwise after the surgery  
19 and what happened and diagnosis, but nothing about this  
20 fact and answering this letter and raising a fellow's  
21 hopes and everything, which is all right with me as I can  
22 go ahead and work. Something is wrong with Compensation  
23 Board office work or medical department, and I think it  
24 is also something wrong when it takes about ten weeks for  
25 appointment of medical examination. From April to July  
26 2nd, 1963. Also it is wrong when it takes five weeks,  
27 several letters and phone calls and personal intervention  
28 to obtain permission to get a pair of orthopaedic shoes.  
29 These are only a few examples of our experience in dealing  
30 with the Workmen's Compensation Board.





Nethercut & Young

2771

Toronto, Ontario

1                    We realize, Your Lordship, we are not going  
2 to gain anything. That is not our aim. We responded  
3 only to the public appeal to get all the facts of the  
4 Workmen's Compensation Board. We do it in the best faith.  
5 It may be useful in one way or another. I heard today  
6 also the discussion of the necessity of the action under  
7 Section 42, in the way of permitting the workman to have,  
8 who was previously partly disabled and to keep working,  
9 and then his disability due to working, or due to other  
10 reasons, increases and that he should be paid for work of  
11 the further disability at the time of increased disability  
12 -- if I am clear in expressing that.

13                  In our particular case the original accident  
14 happened in 1952. The pay was only twelve hundred dollars  
15 a year. Then, in the meantime, the pays increased accord-  
16 ing to the minimum required. Mrs. Ostrowski was kept  
17 working because with five to twenty-five percent she  
18 should not stop working. She was never told to avoid  
19 certain kind of work. Then she paid for eleven years and  
20 carries still the insurance of her premium. Then worsen-  
21 ing occurred and the operation is performed and total dis-  
22 abled or the total now sixty-five percent disabled. What  
23 should be the base? The person who is paying in for that  
24 for eleven or twelve years, the compensation premium,  
25 should be paid according to the pays of 1952 or according  
26 to 1966 when the disability occurs or increases due to  
27 several reasons, but only from the original accident?

28                  THE COMMISSIONER: When you say she paid  
29 the additional premium, you had brought yourselves under  
30 the Act?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2772

1 MR. OSTROWSKI: Yes, sir.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: You and your wife?

3 MR. OSTROWSKI: Yes, both partners and some  
4 of them dropped from the business and only the two remain.  
5 So I don't think that it is my duty, or my job to present  
6 any recommendation. Your Lordship would know best what  
7 to do and the Royal Commission will take notice of all the  
8 remarks.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: As you say, Mr. Ostrowski,  
10 and I believe it to be true, your appeal has gone to the  
11 full gamut to the Board, and there is nothing I can do;  
12 but you appeared here as a public spirited citizen to try  
13 and correct deficiencies in the administration and the  
14 Act yourself. I accept your statement that you came in  
15 that manner and I appreciate it.

16 MR. OSTROWSKI: I only ask that the same  
17 thing that happened to us should not happen to another  
18 workman.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you for this and  
20 for your previous submission.

21 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Osler...

22 MR. OSLER: Mr. Commissioner, this I think  
23 is the last section of the compensation brief and it is  
24 dealing in rehabilitation of the injured employee. It  
25 appears on Page 20 of the brief.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

27 MR. OSLER: Perhaps if I read the brief  
28 to start with, sir:

29 This company considers that rehabilitation  
30 is humane and correct and it makes every endeavour to





Nethercut & Young

2773

Toronto, Ontario

1 rehabilitate a workman who meets with sickness or injury  
2 whether it be industrial or non-industrial. The company  
3 fully appreciates the good work done by the Board in its  
4 rehabilitation program.

5 Through the co-operation of the Board with  
6 many industries and with its advice and working closely  
7 in conjunction with the medical authorities of the Board  
8 and with private practitioners in the local industry, ap-  
9 proved rehabilitation procedures have been established in  
10 many industries and this company actively participates in  
11 such a procedure.

12 It has been the experience of this company  
13 that injured employees who actively co-operate in reha-  
14 bilitation procedures generally progress more satisfac-  
15 torily and rapidly toward recovery. Those who do not co-  
16 operate or actively resist rehabilitation seriously retard  
17 recovery. Apart from the general undesirability of delayed  
18 recovery, it has a direct consequence on the burden borne  
19 by industry. As pointed out in an earlier section of  
20 these submissions, an injured employee on temporary total  
21 disability compensation may be receiving an amount almost  
22 as much as his net earnings prior to the injury. In the  
23 case of an injured employee on temporary partial disability  
24 who is being placed at work, there is also little if any  
25 loss in net earnings. Such a situation actively encour-  
26 ages malingering and resistance to rehabilitation for  
27 human nature cannot be ignored.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Wait a moment. You say  
29 the injured employee on temporary total disability com-  
30 pensation may be receiving an amount almost as much as





Nethercut & Young

2774

Toronto, Ontario

1 his net earnings and in the case of an injured employee on  
2 temporary partial disability who is being placed at work,  
3 there is also little if any loss in net earnings. If he  
4 is back at work, or placed at work, how is there any mal-  
5 inering?

6 MR. OSLER: The situation that might occur  
7 is that a man can be put on a light duty job, and instead  
8 of progressing and rehabilitating himself to the extent he  
9 can get back to his regular employment, he is inclined to  
10 remain at the status quo. If I can give you an example.  
11 If a man is a miner we may bring him back to light duty  
12 and bring him back into the dry or the lamp room and shops,  
13 and within what you would call light duty work. Instead of  
14 progressing and getting back into the next step of light  
15 work underground and then progressing back to his regular  
16 operation, he --

17 THE COMMISSIONER: He prefers to stay on  
18 the light work?

19 MR. OSLER: He makes no progress. For the  
20 above reasons this company submits that where such approved  
21 rehabilitation procedures have been established and it is  
22 determined that a man refuses to co-operate in his re-  
23 habilitation, his compensation for temporary total dis-  
24 ability or temporary partial disability, as the case may  
25 be, should be terminated or reduced and in no event should  
26 an award of permanent partial disability be made.

27 This is the section we were severely criticized  
28 for by the steel worker's presentation as being hard and  
29 heartless. The situation, if we take them in their order,  
30 temporary total disability. Now a man may be injured and





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2775

1 be off work. His doctor may say he has a bruised finger  
2 or a bruised hand. His doctor may not give him a return  
3 to work slip. Yet, obviously he could be back doing a  
4 light duty job. Now our recommendation in that respect  
5 would fall into the next part of the brief where we suggest  
6 there should be some facility for the company to ask for  
7 an independent examination of the workman, to see if he is  
8 in fact totally disabled and not just a doctor saying,  
9 "stay off a few days."

10 In a case like that, if a man does not go  
11 back to work in a light duty job, then we believe his  
12 compensation should be not carried on a full total dis-  
13 ability level.

14 A man on a temporary partial disability if  
15 he has again -- I am not suggesting the company is going  
16 to be the judge -- should be an independent determination;  
17 if the man is not co-operating with rehabilitation and  
18 progressing back to full health when on temporary partial  
19 disability, then again I believe the temporary partial  
20 disability should be reduced. The final point there is  
21 you will have a man on temporary partial disability, and  
22 we have experienced in some cases where the man has con-  
23 tinued on a light duty or modified employment, until such  
24 time as the Board has come to a determination that there  
25 is a permanent partial disability. We have a number of  
26 cases where, if that award hadn't been made, the man is  
27 quickly back to his original occupation. Particularly a  
28 man working as a stope leader or driller on temporary  
29 partial disability. It can't be straight coincidence that  
30 having received an award for permanent partial disability





1 very shortly afterwards the man bids back into his original  
2 job as a stope leader or driller or what have you, back to  
3 his original job. We believe to a certain extent the man  
4 has calculated his chances, and not only obtained his per-  
5 manent partial disability pension, but has gone back and  
6 been able to earn exactly what he was earning before the  
7 accident. We get to this problem, sir, in a section of  
8 our brief we dealt with earlier, to distinguish between  
9 a man who has for instance disfigurement, or something  
10 like that, when working on a particular job may cause him  
11 no disability. It is conceivable if he left our employ-  
12 ment and went somewhere else that there would be, perhaps,  
13 some disability. I must admit that problem could arise,  
14 but our paragraph on Page 21 there, sir, we feel there  
15 should be a policy to have an independent determination  
16 that if a man is not co-operating with rehabilitation,  
17 then his compensation on total temporary disability should  
18 be reduced. That is in the case where he is not going  
19 back to work but is on temporary disability and during  
20 the rehabilitation program he is not co-operating and we  
21 should have an independent determination. During the  
22 course of the rehabilitation program until determined that  
23 rehabilitation cannot succeed, an award for permanent  
24 partial disability should not be made.

25 I think at this time, sir --

26 THE COMMISSIONER: I am not following you  
27 all the way on this. Supposing a man has some injury to  
28 his leg, or something, and comes up with a limp with his  
29 bad leg, or it gives him trouble, and he is not the kind  
30 to quit and he goes back to his regular job. Would he





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2777

1 not be entitled -- does your argument go so far he wouldn't  
2 be entitled to any permanent partial disability because he  
3 is able to go back to work?

4 MR. OSLER: Well, sir, you take an example  
5 such as you have just given and it is hard to say if a man  
6 has a permanent limp; or as a result of an accident has  
7 come up with something, dismemberment, disfigurement which  
8 is permanent; I agree in that case you are dealing with a  
9 question where there is undoubtedly disability of some sort.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: There are lots of old  
11 soldiers going around with pensionable disabilities who  
12 are able to re-establish themselves and work.

13 MR. OSLER: That is quite true and may re-  
14 establish themselves at work in a job, and so long as they  
15 work in that job they have, in fact, no disability.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: There is the other thing,  
17 of course, with a partial disability there is no saying  
18 the time won't come when this man won't be able to carry  
19 on and do his job.

20 MR. OSLER: On the other hand, in this type  
21 of instance you are covered in subsequent disabilities.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I am asking you if you  
23 feel they should be going to the extent that you go in  
24 your second last paragraph, where you determine the man  
25 refuses to co-operate. That is not the case, in the case  
26 of a man where he has rehabilitated himself, if he has per-  
27 manent disability.

28 MR. OSLER: Oh yes --

29 THE COMMISSIONER: On this first one you  
30 mentioned here, haven't you got the power now under "22"





1 "(1)" to demand he submit to medical examination?

2 MR. OSLER: That is true enough, sir, but  
3 there is that provision in the Act that we request a man  
4 report to a doctor of our choosing, and he examines the  
5 man. If a conflict of medical evidence occurs it is re-  
6 ferred to a medical referee. We are dealing here, sir,  
7 with a type of case we think is appropriate which is a  
8 man on total temporary disability who is off for ten days  
9 <sup>go</sup>  
10 or two weeks. You don't/through that procedure in that  
11 period of time. The man is off with a bruised hand or  
finger.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: That is what you are sug-  
13 gesting?

14 MR. OSLER: No, sir. I am suggesting in the  
15 final paragraph while a procedure is available under Sec-  
16 tions 22 and 23 for determination of the condition of the  
17 workman, it is generally too lengthy for such cases and  
18 it is suggested that at the request of the employer an  
19 immediate determination by a medical referee, of the in-  
20 jured employee's ability to go to work, be obtained.

21 I am looking for a direct reference to a  
22 referee, rather than have the company doctor examine the  
23 man, go through that procedure and then go to a third man  
24 as a referee. The employer should be able to ask the  
25 Board to direct the employee to a doctor to determine  
26 whether, in fact, he is totally disabled. This is what  
27 it amounts to, or could that man be back being rehabilitated  
28 in his job. This could be done relatively easily.

29 I understand, although there is nothing in  
30 the Act to make such provision, I am given to understand,





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2779

1 that the Board have acted somewhat along that line. In  
2 other words at the request of an employer they have had  
3 the man examined by a doctor, to determine whether the  
4 disability is as indicated by the employee's own doctor,  
5 but there is nothing in the Act which covers that situ-  
6 ation.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: I can understand that  
8 some such thing might be desirable in a case where the  
9 disability appears to go on too long, but this is a dis-  
10 ability that lasts a week or ten days. A great number of  
11 these things will mount up it seems to me. I question  
12 the desirability of getting into a donnybrook with a man  
13 or his doctor at that stage whether he should go back two  
14 days earlier or not.

15 MR. OSLER: The problem, of course, is the  
16 short term total disability is quite a sizeable amount of  
17 cost. Quite a sizeable amount of cost in the ten day to  
18 two week range. Isn't that correct?

19 This is one of our major areas of difficulty,  
20 sir, we have men who no doubt take the position and will,  
21 "until my doctor tells me I can go back to regular work  
22 I am not going back." This isn't taking advantage of a  
23 situation, I admit. A man is going back to a job which  
24 is not going to be his regular job. It will be a reha-  
25 bilitation scheme. It will favour him in the area in  
26 which he has been injured, but I think the man has an  
27 obligation to go back and not to magnify his injuries or  
28 damages.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, if there had been  
30 gross abuse at least it would seem your request is reason-





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2780

1 able. On the other hand I don't want the workers to be  
2 harassed every time the Board puts them on compensation,  
3 with the Board accepting the doctor's evidence. I suppose  
4 among the medical profession you can get people respon-  
5 sible and others who aren't.

6 MR. OSLER: I think, as pointed out earlier  
7 as one of the problems, it has to be recognized as a pro-  
8 blem that in the northern communities there is a patient-  
9 doctor relationship, and a doctor has to live in that com-  
10 munity and the doctor could find in a great many cases,  
11 he could find great difficulty. I would think, sir, with  
12 the knowledge that I may be a little out of line here, I  
13 would think that the knowledge that there is a doctor-  
14 patient relationship may be subject to independent scrutiny,  
15 it may have some effect on that.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: As it stands at the pre-  
17 sent time, the Board may direct that at any time.

18 MR. OSLER: Presumably the Board may direct  
19 it at any time.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: But you would like the  
21 Board, at the request of the employer, to direct it, or  
22 of its own volition?

23 MR. OSLER: Yes, I certainly think it is  
24 permissible to leave it in the realm of discretion of the  
25 Board. I would like, actually, to have asked that it be  
26 done and the Board have a look at it. It would be the  
27 most satisfactory solution, but it might be the next best  
28 thing to leave it to the Board's discretion.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

30 MR. OSLER: I have really dealt with the





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2781

1 last paragraph of our written submission, that is asking  
2 an amendment to Sections 22 and 23. I would like to point  
3 out, sir, I have had an opportunity throughout the hear-  
4 ings of speaking to Mr. Kerr and other members of the  
5 Workmen's Compensation Board, and I am advised the use of  
6 the word "referee" in our brief here, insofar as the  
7 Board is concerned, is probably a little different from  
8 the person I am envisaging. They envisage a referee as  
9 a senior member of the Board itself. I was not referring  
10 to that sort of a referee as a senior member of the Board,  
11 whether you call him a referee or arbitor.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: They consider the referee  
13 as a senior member of the medical profession?

14 MR. OSLER: I think it is of the Board it-  
15 self. Mr. Kerr might correct me. They see him as a sen-  
16 ior person in the Board, but we were looking to a situation  
17 that if such a person were appointed in Sudbury, the Board  
18 would appoint a doctor, a local doctor who would make this  
19 examination, rather than a doctor the Board normally uses  
20 as a referee. Perhaps Mr. Kerr --

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Why use the term "referee"  
22 at all, if you want a further examination by another me-  
23 dical man?

24 MR. OSLER: I was trying to distinguish be-  
25 tween the present provisions of Section 22 that a company  
26 be asked to have their doctor appointed, and then if a  
27 difference of opinion occurs, it goes to a referee. I  
28 am asking that the doctor be one of the Board's choosing,  
29 not the company's.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: A further examination by





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2782

1 a medical man of the Board's choice?

2 MR. OSLER: Yes, sir.

3 I would like to cover one point today, sir.

4 In order to correct what might be a misapprehension by  
5 something I said the last time I appeared.

6 This is in connection with the reducing of  
7 an employee's compensation to fifty percent, and I think  
8 I made the statement that we had found no examples of  
9 that, and may have given the impression this was of the  
10 Board's own volition, and I did not mean to suggest that.  
11 The Board, of course, acts on the advice of the medical  
12 reports received, and where they have a medical report  
13 indicating a man is not fit to work, the Board acts accord-  
14 ingly; and I want to correct any impression I gave that  
15 the Board are not keeping the people on disability when  
16 that is not the case. They follow, obviously, the advice  
17 of doctors to make their determination.

18 I talked, sir, of the rehabilitation pro-  
19 gramme of the company. I think to put it in its correct  
20 light, I should give you some information as to the safety  
21 scheme and program of the company. Mr. Young, who is with  
22 me, is the superintendent of safety of the company. He  
23 has an office and staff and in addition to that he has  
24 some eighteen safety engineers. Two people, a technician  
25 and another engineer doing special checks on specific  
26 features of our operation.

27 These men and Mr. Young's department totally  
28 are responsible and do develop programmes of safety, in-  
29 volving safety instructions, demonstrations, consultation  
30 with the production people. They inspect all machinery,





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2783

1 conditions and practices. In other words they are taking  
2 in not only the physical equipment but also the human el-  
3 ement.

4 They, of course, as we expect any man of our  
5 management to do, immediately stop, or cause any machinery,  
6 ways or anything else to be stopped, if there is any ques-  
7 tion of unsafety, and they prevent and stop unsafe pra-  
8 ctices. They are responsible for accident prevention,  
9 including health. They operate and run meetings once a  
10 month with the local superintendent of the particular  
11 operation, whereby all levels of management down to the  
12 first level are present, dealing with safety and subjects  
13 of programmes and so on. There is instituted and they  
14 are required to record on-job safety instructions. Each  
15 individual last member of management must carry through  
16 once a week on the job demonstrations of the correct ways  
17 and means of carrying out various efforts. He must check  
18 for the individuals he has instructed so all his employees  
19 will receive these various features of instruction. Now,  
20 over the course of that time, this is repetitive, he will  
21 be instructed on the safe way of drilling. No drilling  
22 in missed holes, no drillings that will cause dangerous  
23 fractures and so on. It is a comprehensive programme at  
24 the company's level and, of course, it is the responsi-  
25 bility of the company under the Mining Act to maintain  
26 this operation.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Are they, on the safety  
28 section, a full time people?

29 MR. OSLER: Yes. Those are people full  
30 time on safety and nothing else.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2784

1 THE COMMISSIONER: They don't have any com-  
2 pany safety associations or anything?

3 MR. OSLER: I think the company is a member  
4 of the association. The association on safety.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: But within the company  
6 yourself, you don't operate by the safety association?

7 MR. OSLER: Indirectly, through the safety  
8 department, which of course works again very closely with  
9 our first-aid department. Our safety department, of  
10 course, works with the Workmen's Compensation Board and  
11 my understanding is it is a close and satisfactory re-  
12 lationship.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: You called them safety  
14 engineers?

15 MR. OSLER: They are men who are trained.  
16 Normally, sir, men taken out of the management and super-  
17 visory level of production. They will be trained and  
18 act as safety engineers and will eventually, with one or  
19 two exceptions, go back into the production field again.  
20 So they are not people who are off completely on safety,  
21 and might be sort of becoming divorced from the knowledge  
22 of the production methods and so on. They are men who  
23 will go on to the safety department and be trained in  
24 safety procedures with Mr. Young, and after a period as  
25 safety engineer, and this would probably be involved with  
26 a promotion, he would be promoted back to production. His  
27 place will be taken by a new safety engineer. He comes  
28 from production and eventually goes back to production.

29 Now with that background, sir, we come to  
30 rehabilitation. The company's programme or procedure is





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2755

1 that a man is never permitted to go back to work who has  
2 been injured, unless there is slip from his doctor, or  
3 a Board doctor, authorizing him to go back to work. Now,  
4 examples were given of two cases at the company, one they  
5 approved and one they thought improper rehabilitation. I  
6 can only advise you, sir, that the man with the crutches  
7 has never come back to work, and would not be back or  
8 allowed in the plant without the permission of his own  
9 doctor in this case. The fact that he sits and does  
10 nothing -- there is a job of work to do -- the fact he  
11 has done nothing is not the failure of the rehabilitation  
12 process, but could be the lack of co-operation of the  
13 individual to do the very relatively minor amount of  
14 work there; but the man who is given a clearance and  
15 comes back we have taken him back. It is a very, very  
16 exceptional thing to take a man on crutches. We just  
17 basically wouldn't do it, because he is too handicapped  
18 at that point but obviously his doctor has permitted him  
19 and we have been able to find a very sedentary job for  
20 him to do, during the period of his incapacity. The main  
21 point is a man doesn't come back to our rehabilitation  
22 without doctor's authorization.

23                   The man who has, I think I explained the  
24 other day, a man who has some minor injury, a cut on the  
25 finger which involves no compensation and no lost time,  
26 he will be kept an eye on. He will be kept out of the  
27 wet area so there will be no question of infection or any-  
28 thing of that kind of thing. When a man has been away  
29 for a long period of time, and a long period of rehabili-  
30 tation is indicated, and this is looking at a real long





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2786

1 term injury, he will come back to us probably in two  
2 ways, one from the Workmen's Compensation Rehabilitation  
3 Centre, or possibly by the direction of an orthopaedic  
4 surgeon or some person like that who is a specialist in  
5 the Sudbury district. He is interviewed by Mr. Young  
6 and his officials in the general safety office, to obtain  
7 some idea of what his capabilities are and what limit-  
8 ations of work he can perform. He is sent back to his  
9 own plant or mine and he reports to the local safety of-  
10 ficer and is started in on a job consistent with a medi-  
11 cal recommendation, and the job available for a ninety  
12 day rehabilitation period.

13 During that period he reports to the local  
14 safety engineer every week, or he can discuss his pro-  
15 gress on the job with the safety engineer. Each week,  
16 of course, the safety engineer keeps constant check with  
17 the man's progress in rehabilitating himself. During  
18 this period he is certainly encouraged to take the oppor-  
19 tunity to bid on to any jobs that may be open, as long  
20 as it will be in a suitable range. This will be a job  
21 over the base rate, so he will have to take a chance on  
22 his seniority and other tests to fill the vacancy, but  
23 it is open to him and he is entitled to bid. If, at the  
24 end of ninety days, the man has made good progress but  
25 is not yet able to get back to his normal job, a further  
26 period of -- a further ninety day period may be extended  
27 in order to bring him back up. If, at the end of ninety  
28 days, he has not made the effort for good rehabilitation  
29 and we have determined our rehabilitation efforts are  
30 useless and ineffective, we advise the Board to that





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2787

1 effect and the man goes off light duty. He is offered a  
2 job at his regular employment if he wants it, but he goes  
3 off the preferred light duty. That is basically the re-  
4 habilitation job we do.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: You have some control  
6 over one of the situations you referred to, that is where  
7 a man is back on light duty and you think he is probably  
8 making every effort he should, there is nothing to stop  
9 you reporting that to the Board and asking that he have  
10 an outside medical.

11 MR. OSLER: This would be a question of a  
12 temporary partial disability. The medical determination  
13 is not so important in that phase, sir, as it is in the  
14 total temporary. If a man is back at work and back with  
15 the Board's knowledge and instruction, it is a temporary  
16 total disability with a man in the first week or ten days  
17 or so, after his injury.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: It is not the short time  
19 injury people you are asking the amendment for?

20 MR. OSLER: Yes, it is the short term, the  
21 week to ten day man who is on total temporary disability  
22 that we really feel is a situation where we would like the  
23 ability to ask the Board to appoint a doctor to examine  
24 him, to see if he can determine if the man can get back  
25 to work.

26 We, no doubt, and I must admit the company  
27 does in fact attempt to keep checks on their individual  
28 employees who may have suffered any type of injury. If a  
29 man reported into the first-aid coming off shift with a  
30 cut which he may have dressed at first-aid, as I advised





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1940

1 you the other day a check is kept of that man. If he does  
2 not come to work we find out if it is something relating  
3 to his finger. To that extent we call the men to deter-  
4 mine their condition. We have sent the first-aid men out  
5 to determine the condition of a man where there is a sus-  
6 pected injury or illness, and to that extent we harass  
7 the man if that's the definition of harassment. We encourage  
8 men to get back to work. There is no doubt about that.  
9 If this is harassment then we come within that definition,  
10 but I doubt, in fact, it is harassment, but the man is  
11 encouraged to go back to work. We have to find out what  
12 is their condition and is it a result of something that  
13 occurred at work as a result of an injury.

14 Mr. Young, I have not got statistics of  
15 this, but Mr. Young advised me personally about twenty or  
16 thirty cases a year would be men who in fact got a minor  
17 injury, but stayed off work and did not take part in re-  
18 habilitation.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: That is your information?

20 MR. OSLER: Mr. Young's estimate would be  
21 twenty or thirty men a year. All men coming back, of  
22 course, are directed to a job that is in the capabilities  
23 of a man as diagnosed by a doctor, and if there is any  
24 question about the doctor's report the safety department,  
25 or safety engineer, will contact the doctor to determine  
26 what is the area a man can go to. We have had cases where  
27 a doctor had some fear in telling the man to go to work.  
28 We call back the doctor and tell him the type of work the  
29 man would be doing and then in a case like that he says,  
30 no, he shouldn't be doing heavy lifting or twisting or





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1 whatever it is. I think sir, that deals primarily with  
2 the rehabilitation section.

3 I want to, if I may, deal with some rather  
4 ancillary matters. It was suggested at one stage there  
5 were more back injuries with men from another province and  
6 the province referred to was Newfoundland. I ran a check  
7 and only four injured men were from Newfoundland

8 THE COMMISSIONER: The number of back in-  
9 jured men were from Newfoundland?

10 MR. OSLER: It was suggested these men were  
11 from Newfoundland. Why it should have been chosen as the  
12 province I don't know. We have means of checking that.

13 MR. ESTEY: They were saying it was inex-  
14 perience.

15 MR. OSLER: Our estimate is that for back  
16 cases the incidents of back cases in 1965 and 1966, would  
17 not be a question of most of them being men of a year or  
18 two year's service. There would be a proportion of them  
19 but nothing to explain the size of those figures.

20 In our brief, sir, an example we gave of a  
21 man earning one hundred dollars, it was pointed out the  
22 company wrote a letter to P.S.I. I would apologize to  
23 the Commission, in fact, every one of the fringe benefits  
24 with the exception of P.S.I., and that would include the  
25 Ontario Hospital, life insurance, sickness and accident,  
26 those are in fact all paid by the company for a period of  
27 one year following the man's injury.

28 MR. ESTEY: All paid?

29 MR. OSLER: Those are paid by the company  
30 en toto but P.S.I., is not. That is the thirty-nine cents.





Nethercut & Young

2700

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. ESTEY: Page twelve at the very top,  
2 that note has to be added to it.

3 MR. OSLER: Basically the programmes are  
4 shared fifty fifty. The company and employees share fifty  
5 fifty, with the exception of P.S.I. where the company  
6 bears sixty percent and the man forty percent. If the man  
7 goes on compensation the company picks up one hundred per  
8 cent of hospital insurance and life insurance. One hun-  
9 dred percent of the Ontario Hospital, group life, sickness  
10 and accident insurance the company picks up one hundred  
11 percent for one year after the accident. In the case of  
12 P.S.I., the company has it for one month and thereafter  
13 the employee is responsible to pay his forty percent if he  
14 wants to continue the coverage.

15 MR. ESTEY: What about the Canada Pension,  
16 Mr. Osler, which category does that fall into?

17 MR. OSLER: Mr. Young can tell you that.  
18 Our information is everything but P.S.I. I was particu-  
19 larly interested in this particular company plan, in view  
20 of the suggestion, I was under the impression originally  
21 they were all paid. P.S.I. is the only one but the in-  
22 come tax, of course, is not chargeable. Unemployment is  
23 not. I gather the union waives their dues during the  
24 period, but the others with the exception of P.S.I. are  
25 paid by the company for a year. The problem of the Canad-  
26 a Pension Plan is based on earnings. It is an earnings'  
27 situation and this is why I wonder on what basis would a  
28 payment be made and whether on the basis of compensation  
29 or not.

30 Sir, with that I would like, if I might.





Nethercut & Young

2791

Toronto, Ontario

1 read the final conclusion of our brief. Just before read-  
2 ing that, sir, I still think I must emphasize the situ-  
3 ation that if these cases are to be dealt with under Work-  
4 men's Compensation, with the request for complete coverage  
5 and no loss in earnings in any way shape or form, we are  
6 really coming to the situation where we are looking at  
7 a negligence matter where, in each and every case, the  
8 company has been one hundred percent negligent and we must  
9 remember that in a great many cases and well over fifty  
10 percent of the cases it is not the company's negligence  
11 which causes the accidents. When you are considering the  
12 question of percentages of compensation this must be born  
13 in mind.

14 In reading the summation, the company wishes  
15 to repeat that, in its opinion, the Workmen's Compensation  
16 Act of Ontario has been of inestimable value to both em-  
17 ployees and employers in the province. It wishes to em-  
18 phasize, however, that any amendment which would have the  
19 effect of casting upon the classes of industries as con-  
20 stituted at that time financial burden resulting from  
21 accidents/past years, or which would increase the amount  
22 of compensation payable, as compared with the income  
23 available to the employee had he not been injured, to a  
24 point beyond proper insurance practice, would be unsound  
25 and detrimental to the interest and welfare of Ontario  
26 industry and in the case of the latter type of amendment  
27 would severely jeopardize the recently developed rehabili-  
28 tation procedures which in fact require positive assistance  
29 if they are to be fully effective.

30 The company wishes to draw particular atten-





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2792

1 tition to the alarming increase in disabilities to the back  
2 which in its opinion is not attributable to industry, and  
3 points to the urgent need of amendment to the Workmen's  
4 Compensation Act to remove the unjustifiable burden placed  
5 on industry by the payment of compensation where disability  
6 is not truly connected with employment.

7 The company believes that the Workmen's  
8 Compensation Act should not as a result of political pres-  
9 sure or expedience be confused with or distorted into that  
10 type of legislation which may be required from time to  
11 time for the relief of persons who may suffer through dis-  
12 ablement from causes not attributable to their work or by  
13 reason of the increased cost of living, for the relief  
14 of indigents, or for old age pensions, mother's allowance  
15 and similar charitable or social purposes.

16 All of which is respectfully submitted. The  
17 International Nickel Company of Canada, Limited.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Osler,  
19 Mr. Estey have you any questions?

20 MR. ESTEY: One question is have you had  
21 time to look at Table 10, 11 and 12 submitted last week  
22 by Mr. MacDonald, in connection with comparable cases in  
23 your rating, I take it 076?

24 MR. OSLER: I don't think I have seen the  
25 tables, Mr. Estey, I am sorry.

26 MR. ESTEY: We will give them to you then  
27 and you might look them over. They are computations  
28 based on the numbers of compensable cases in your indus-  
29 try for the years 1960 to 1965. It compares those to the  
30 frequency rates of the schedule one as a whole.





1 MR. OSLER: A big table where it indicates  
2 the various amounts for compensation, medical and so on?

3 MR. ESTEY: No, this just gives the number  
4 of claims for each of those six years for your rate on  
5 schedule one, and the frequency rate for one million man  
6 hours and the payroll fluctuations in the same number of  
7 years. For example, you can see from 1964 to 1965 your  
8 payroll went up eleven point eight percent, whereas in  
9 that same year your claims filed increased thirty-nine  
10 percent and so on.

11 MR. OSLER: The payroll, of course, is not  
12 necessarily -- I think I am right in saying this that a  
13 payroll is not necessarily the guide. It is correct if  
14 your wage rates are stable but not if you have a wage in-  
15 crease and there has been a general wage increase every  
16 year.

17 MR. ESTEY: Yes, but you have to figure out  
18 your collective agreement terms and take that percentage  
19 out of the increase in wages, but for that frequency of  
20 one million man hours, which is objective, your frequency  
21 went up ten point seven percent and at the same time your  
22 number of claims, in gross, went up some thirty-nine per-  
23 cent, so it would look as though your employment increased  
24 in that same year. Have you any comments on this?

25 MR. OSLER: I haven't seen that, I am afraid.  
26 The only thing I observe, Mr. Estey would be I am not sure.  
27 It could be very confusing, the mining and smelting or  
28 taking in the copper refinery, or --

29 MR. ESTEY: Just the 076 rating is all that  
30 is in the table.





Nethercut & Young

2794

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. OSLER: Well, our numbers of employees  
2 you will see --

3 MR. ESTEY: There is a little blue book  
4 that covers that, however, instead of taking the time of  
5 the Commission right now, if you have any comments would  
6 you get in touch with us?

7 MR. OSLER: Mr. Estey, that table I filed  
8 on Exhibit "26" would give you the fluctuation of the  
9 number of employees. We went up eleven hundred men be-  
10 tween 1964 and 1965, but that was in mining and smelting.

11 MR. ESTEY: When you are looking at the  
12 Tables 10, 11, 12 and 13 the rate covers mining reduction  
13 smelting treatment for nickel and copper.

14 MR. OSLER: Does it include railways? That  
15 does include the railways, I am sorry.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: If you have not had a  
17 copy of this, we can secure one for you.

18 MR. OSLER: No, sir, we have not had one

19 MR. KERR: I will be glad to provide Mr.  
20 Osler with the copies.

21 MR. ESTEY: I have two topics to ask you  
22 about. I will be brief. The rehabilitation, the ninety  
23 day plan you described, what is International Nickel's  
24 policy about discharging a man who is injured and cannot  
25 do the work?

26 MR. OSLER: This is just the very thing,  
27 Mr. Estey. We not only try to find him occupational em-  
28 ployment, we bring him back to light duty and go to every  
29 effort to give him work. The driller doesn't go back to  
30 drilling. He may work in the dry, the lamp room, in a





Nethercut & Young

2705

Toronto, Ontario

1 warehouse underground, but to preferred light work as  
2 soon as the doctor clears him.

3 MR. ESTEY: You give him medically approved  
4 work and you keep him on that until you decide he can't  
5 get back to his old trade?

6 MR. OSIER: Until he assimilates himself  
7 into a position where he goes back to his original job,  
8 or back into some light job. He may have been a driller  
9 or working in the stope. He may go back as a switchman  
10 or motorman.

11 MR. ESTEY: That is the man on light duty.  
12 What is your policy on a man who has a temporary total  
13 disability and he is off for that solidly for six months,  
14 what does the company do? Do they wait until he is back?

15 MR. OSLER: If he has a temporary total dis-  
16 ability he does not come back unless his doctor recommends  
17 him to come back to work.

18 MR. ESTEY: Do you discharge him?

19 MR. OSLER: Now the only time we do, it  
20 isn't a question of discharge it is going to be a question  
21 of severing employment. This is a man who has not worked  
22 for some time and has been cut off his recall right, and  
23 that sort of thing. If, for example, that man while on  
24 compensation would have been laid off because of reduction  
25 in the working, if his seniority had come up, and if he  
26 was off long enough so the period of time for recall would  
27 have gone and never come back, we would treat him as though  
28 he would have continued and been laid off in due course.

29 MR. ESTEY: If there had been no reduction  
30 in the work force, how long do you wait?





Nethercut & Young  
London

2796

1 MR. OSLER: We never close a man off except  
2 say, a man who is completely and truly permanently totally  
3 disabled. Of course, even if he recovered we would re-  
4 employ him.

5 MR. ESTEY: Let me move on to safety matters  
6 and I am finished. We have heard considerable about the  
7 Mine's Accident Prevention Association and, I take it,  
8 International Nickel is an active member in that Association?

**9** MR. OSLER: Yes.

10 MR. ESTEY: Do you have safety meetings on  
11 company time of supervisory personnel under training?

12 MR. OSLER: I am sorry I didn't make this  
13 point clear, Mr. Estey. Our safety department once a  
14 month has all members of the supervision -- and that is  
15 in the various plants and mines -- are gathered under the  
16 supervisor of that plant and safety engineer Mr. Young,  
17 at which time they will receive safety instruction, edu-  
18 cation and all the requirements are given to the super-  
19 visory level of the operation.

20 MR. ESTEY: I take it that instruction is  
21 given on the job?

22 MR. OSLER: On the job instruction is given  
23 once a week for every shift. Possibly to every junior.  
24 This is a full demonstration, not just instruction. A  
25 full demonstration of a particular facet of prevention  
26 work.

27 MR. ESTEY: Do you have visits from the re-  
28 presentatives of the Mine's Accident Prevention Association?

29 MR. OSLER: Yes, we do.

30 MR. ESTEY: Do they participate in the on





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2797

1 the job training?

2 MR. OSLER: Perhaps Mr. Young could answer.

3 MR. YOUNG: Mr. Estey, yes. Due to the type  
4 of our organization they do not spend a lot of their time  
5 with us, but when we need them they help us. They supply  
6 us with films. All their films are shown on the property.  
7 Any time they visit they come to help us. In the Sudbury  
8 area they will come three or four times a year, but they  
9 cover a lot of the rest of Ontario at the same time.

10 MR. ESTEY: We heard they divide the country  
11 into areas and groups and the various mining communities  
12 form their own discussion groups for safety, under the  
13 Mine's Accident Association. Does International Nickel  
14 belong to one of these?

15 MR. YOUNG: We don't have a group in the  
16 Sudbury area, there is only Falconbridge and ourselves and  
17 actually we have different problems. Mr. Osler explained  
18 to you they do come up and help with the shafting group.  
19 We have a shafting group in the safety programme.

20 MR. OSLER: For the town?

21 MR. YOUNG: For the contractors who are  
22 sinking shafts for us. The Mine's Accident Prevention  
23 Association do come in and give them a lot of help.

24 MR. OSLER: This shaft sinking is carried  
25 out by an independent contractor, not by the normal methods.

26 MR. ESTEY: But the two mines, Falconbridge  
27 and yourself, operate their safety programmes independently  
28 but you are both members of the Association?

29 MR. YOUNG: Yes. They give us help any time  
30 we ask for it and they send every month literature to us





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2798

1 which we use in the safety programme.

2 MR. ESTEY: The safety regulations are those  
3 of the Department of Mines for the underground institutions  
4 and the Department of Mines for above ground plants, but  
5 some of your equipment is under the Department of Labour  
6 regulations?

7 MR. OSLER: That is right. The Mining Act  
8 pretty well covers all aspects insofar as regulations in  
9 relationship to safe operations. There is the Boiler and  
10 Pressure Vessels Act, the Operating Engineer's Act. The  
11 Department of Labour do come in and inspect but they do  
12 this in co-operation with the Department of Mines. If a  
13 boiler inspector can't get up immediately, the Department  
14 of Mines' inspector, who is an engineer, will come in and  
15 look at the boiler.

16 MR. ESTEY: And your educational programme  
17 takes into account all the regulations, the Department of  
18 Mine's Regulations, the Department of Labour Regulations  
19 as well?

20 MR. YOUNG: Yes, and the Department of  
21 Health where you bring first-aid.

22 MR. OSLER: It takes in the Compensation's  
23 own safety regulations which in many cases are more re-  
24 strictive than those in the Mining Act.

25 MR. ESTEY: Do you have any regulations  
26 suggested to you by the Mine's Accident Prevention Associ-  
27 ation?

28 MR. YOUNG: Yes, they will pass on to us  
29 conditions or suggestions that may have come about by  
30 their travelling to other parts of Ontario, and they will





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2799

1 pass on literature to us to see if we can use the suggestions or regulations in our own property.

2  
3 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Young, thank you very much,  
4 and Mr. Osler. That is all we have.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: That concludes this, Mr.  
6 Estey? It is necessary to adjourn until Wednesday morn-  
7 ing for the convenience of those who wish to appear and  
8 were not able to come tomorrow, so we are adjourning until  
9 Wednesday at 10:00 A.M.

10  
11 \*\*\*\*  
12  
13

14 The Commission adjourned at  
15 4:50 P.M.  
16  
17 \*\*\*\*  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30







PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

HEARINGS HELD AT  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

VOL. NO.

20

2 November 1966

Official Report

NETHERCUT & YOUNG LTD.  
48 York Street  
TORONTO 1, ONTARIO  
TELEPHONE





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1 IN THE MATTER OF The Public Inquiries  
2 C. 1960, Ch. 323

3 - and -  
4

5 IN THE MATTER OF an Inquiry Into and  
6 port Upon The Workmen's Compensation  
7

8 BEFORE: The Honourable Mr. Justice G.A.  
9 McGillivray, Commissioner, at  
10 Room 200, 67 Richmond Street  
11 Toronto, Ontario, on  
12 Wednesday, November 2, 1966

13 APPEARANCES:

14 A.Z. Estey (C.C.) Counsel to the Commission  
and )  
15 D.J. Sutcliffe ) Construction Safety Association  
D. Campbell )  
G. Sampson )  
B. Legge ) Workmen's Compensation Board  
W.R. Kerr )  
International Nickel Company

16 . . . . .  
17 . . . . .  
18 . . . . .  
19 . . . . .  
20 . . . . .  
21 . . . . .  
22 . . . . .  
23 . . . . .  
24 . . . . .  
25 . . . . .  
26 . . . . .  
27 . . . . .  
28 . . . . .  
29 . . . . .  
30 . . . . .





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

INDEX

1	Construction Safety Association	2801
2	Workmen's Compensation Board	2863
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		

ERRATA

END 7

10 Page 825, line 24: "\$150" should read "\$115"

11 Page 826, line 3: "\$2.00" should read "\$7.00"

12 Page 835, line 29: "some" should read "sum"

-----





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2801

1 --- At 10:00 A.M., the Hearing Commenced.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. Estey...

3 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Commissioner, we have with  
4 us this morning the officers of the Construction Safety  
5 Association and we may start with them. Would you gentle-  
6 men for the record introduce yourselves so the transcript  
7 will reveal your identify?

8 MR. DAVID CAMPBELL: I am David Campbell,  
9 President of the Construction Safety Association for 1966.  
10 I am a contractor by occupation.

11 MR. GIL SAMPSON: I am Gil Sampson, General  
12 Manager of the Construction Safety Association.

13 MR. ESTEY: Gentlemen, we have heard from  
14 the other safety associations their views on how they are  
15 functioning as a voluntary agency in the community, seek-  
16 ing to improve the safety standards and lowering the in-  
17 cidents of accidents; and how these associations should  
18 operate in their roll with regard to construction. We  
19 have heard directly from the contractors on one hand, and  
20 a great deal from the participating trade unions on the  
21 other hand as to the level of safety efficiency in this  
22 industry and to what should or should not be done about  
23 it. In order to perhaps guide you in what you want to  
24 discuss with us, the trade unions have taken exception to  
25 the procedures your associations follow, in generating  
26 your efforts one-third into mass media safety announce-  
27 ments and about one-third into instruction, and about  
28 one-third to all the rest of the things, overhead, salaries,  
29 posters and so on.

30 First of all, would you advise the Commis-





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2802

1 sioner what your 1966 budget is, how it is made up and  
2 hopefully what percentage of the industrial assessment,  
3 the construction industrial assessment, this budget re-  
4 presents? I don't know which one of you wishes to speak.

5 MR. CAMPBELL: The 1966 budget was one  
6 million three hundred and fourteen thousand five hundred  
7 dollars. It was made up of general administration, seven-  
8 ty-four thousand --

9 MR. ESTEY: Excuse me, what is that figure?

10 MR. CAMPBELL: Administration, seventy-four  
11 thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars. Director's  
12 meetings and travelling expenses, ten thousand dollars.  
13 General office, one hundred and forty-eight thousand three  
14 hundred and twenty-five dollars. Educational department,  
15 three hundred and thirty-eight thousand one hundred and  
16 thirty dollars.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: What is that figure?

18 MR. CAMPBELL: Three hundred and thirty-  
19 eight thousand one hundred and thirty dollars. The man-  
20 agement counselling department, one hundred and twelve  
21 thousand four hundred dollars.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Again I will have to ask  
23 you please?

24 MR. CAMPBELL: One hundred and twelve thou-  
25 sand four hundred dollars. The analytical department,  
26 four thousand five hundred dollars. Advertising and  
27 public relations, six hundred and twenty-six thousand  
28 three hundred and ninety-five dollars.

29 MR. ESTEY: Is that the total?

30 MR. CAMPBELL: That is the total.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2803

1                   MR. ESTEY: And the 1965 figure we heard  
2 was one million two hundred thousand dollars?

3                   MR. CAMPBELL: One million one hundred and  
4 sixty thousand dollars. I can give you the proposed for  
5 1967 if you want. It was approved by a director's meet-  
6 ing yesterday. This hasn't been submitted to the Work-  
7 men's Compensation Board but if it is of any help to you  
8 it is, general administration --

9                   MR. ESTEY: What is the total to start with?

10                  MR. CAMPBELL: One million four hundred and  
11 fifty-three thousand nine hundred and seventy-eight dol-  
12 lars.

13                  MR. ESTEY: Right.

14                  MR. CAMPBELL: General administration,  
15 sixty-three thousand three hundred and eighty-five dollars;  
16 director's meetings, eleven thousand five hundred dollars;  
17 general office, one hundred and forty-six thousand one  
18 hundred and thirty-five; education, four hundred and  
19 twenty-four thousand two hundred and fifteen dollars;  
20 management counselling, one hundred and forty-five thou-  
21 sand five hundred and one dollars; analytical department,  
22 one hundred and two thousand and two dollars.

23                  MR. ESTEY: What is that amount, one hundred  
24 and two thousand?

25                  MR. CAMPBELL: One hundred and two thousand  
26 and two dollars.

27                  THE COMMISSIONER: It was four thousand five  
28 hundred dollars for the last year?

29                  MR. CAMPBELL: That is correct. Advertising  
30 and public relations, five hundred and sixty-two thousand





Nethercut & Young

2804

Toronto, Ontario

1 two hundred and forty dollars.

2 MR. ESTEY: Was that analytical figure up  
3 from four thousand five hundred dollars to one hundred  
4 and two thousand?

5 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

6 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Campbell, perhaps you could  
7 explain the items. What, first of all, is general admin-  
8 istration for? There is sixty-three thousand for next  
9 year, what would that include?

10 MR. CAMPBELL: It includes the salaries of  
11 our General Manager, and the Assistant General Manager.  
12 There are employee benefits and there are travelling ex-  
13 penses and the meetings and special meetings and seminar  
14 expense.

15 MR. ESTEY: For those people?

16 MR. CAMPBELL: For the whole organization.

17 MR. ESTEY: These meetings are in the gener-  
18 al administration are they?

19 MR. CAMPBELL: Those particular meetings,  
20 yes, sir.

21 MR. ESTEY: Is the total figure you gave us  
22 one million three hundred and fourteen thousand dollars.  
23 How does that compare to one million one hundred and sixty  
24 thousand and it is broken down in the annual report of the  
25 Board, which is Exhibit "18". Here the Construction  
26 Safety Association received from the Board one million  
27 one hundred and sixty thousand but they also received,  
28 in the form of free rent I suppose, forty-two hundred dol-  
29 lars, and showed a Workmen's Compensation Board adminis-  
30 tration expense of forty-two thousand.





Nethercut & Young

2805

Toronto, Ontario

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Where did you find those  
2 figures?

3 MR. ESTEY: Page nineteen, Mr. Commissioner.

4 MR. CAMPBELL: The answer to that is the  
5 figures I have given you do not include the incumbrance  
6 put on by the W.C.B.

7 MR. ESTEY: So that is equivalent to the  
8 grant in the annual report last year of one million one  
9 hundred and sixty thousand? That was a cash grant?

10 MR. CAMPBELL: That is correct.

11 MR. ESTEY: Then in your director's expense,  
12 that is the cost of bringing them to the meetings in  
13 Toronto?

14 MR. CAMPBELL: The meetings necessarily  
15 have not all been in Toronto, because there are twenty  
16 thousand contractors and most of them are in the communi-  
17 ties close to Toronto and Hamilton, so the preponderance  
18 of our directorship comes from this area, but we have had  
19 meetings at Sarnia and the Lakehead.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: There are twenty thou-  
21 sand members in your association?

22 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Are all the contractors  
24 numbered?

25 MR. CAMPBELL: Every workman with a Work-  
26 men's Compensation number.

27 MR. ESTEY: How many employees is that?

28 MR. CAMPBELL: I can give you an approxi-  
29 mate number, two hundred and twenty-five thousand.

30 MR. ESTEY: About ten percent of the total





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

1 coverage of the Board is in construction, is that right?  
2 What percentage of your 1966 assessment under those two  
3 classes which comprise the Construction Safety Associa-  
4 tion, twenty-three and twenty-four?

5 MR. SAMPSON: And twenty-one, sir.

6 MR. ESTEY: Is represented by your 1966  
7 budget?

8 MR. CAMPBELL: I believe about six percent  
9 but I could be wrong.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: What?

11 MR. ESTEY: About six percent.

12 MR. SAMPSON: That is an estimate at this  
13 time. What we estimate the assessment might be in 1966.

14 MR. ESTEY: What would the figure be in  
15 1965?

16 MR. SAMPSON: In 1965, five percent.

17 MR. ESTEY: So you are spending more, re-  
18 latively, in the Construction Safety Association than the  
19 other associations whose average is three point eight per-  
20 cent?

21 MR. CAMPBELL: That is right.

22 MR. ESTEY: Does the item, 'general office  
23 expense', I take it, one hundred and forty-eight thousand  
24 is for the office staff situated in Toronto?

25 MR. CAMPBELL: That is correct.

26 MR. ESTEY: And the cost of running the  
27 office?

28 MR. CAMPBELL: Telephone, telegraph, legal  
29 aid, stationery and office supplies, membership and sub-  
30 scriptions, equipment repairs and maintaining new equip-





Neihercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

17-7

1 ment, printing and publishing.

2 MR. ESTEY: Then you gave a heading for  
3 "education", for the education department of three hundred  
4 and thirty-eight thousand this year; four hundred and  
5 twenty-four thousand next year. What is that money spent  
6 on, how is it spent?

7 MR. CAMPBELL: Our educational department  
8 consists of, at the moment, fourteen instructors with two  
9 supervisors you might say. These employees put on edu-  
10 cational -- we have three types of educational courses and  
11 fifteen special courses -- and we have talked directly at  
12 seventeen thousand two hundred and thirty-four people in  
13 educational courses.

14 MR. ESTEY: During 1965?

15 MR. CAMPBELL: During 1966, to this moment.

16 MR. ESTEY: Let me interrupt you if I may.  
17 You give safety courses. Are they on the job, in the  
18 evening or what?

19 MR. CAMPBELL: Some of them are on the job  
20 and some in the evening.

21 MR. ESTEY: Where are they given?

22 MR. CAMPBELL: We go to a large contractor's  
23 site, on his premises.

24 MR. ESTEY: Right on the site in daytime?

25 MR. CAMPBELL: Quite a few of the different  
26 courses are given right on the site.

27 MR. ESTEY: Are the men given the courses  
28 supervisory personnel or workmen?

29 MR. CAMPBELL: I can give you a little bit  
30 of an idea of the breakdown of the total I gave you, and





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2808

1 I hope it balances. Labour is three thousand seven hun-  
2 dred and twenty; tradesmen eight thousand four hundred  
3 and ninety-one; supervisory two thousand nine hundred and  
4 twenty-seven. Safety supervisors four hundred and four,  
5 executives seven hundred and sixty-two, engineers three  
6 hundred and eight and not known six hundred and twenty-  
7 two.

8 MR. ESTEY: That includes those numbers in-  
9 cluded in both on the job instruction and classes?

10 MR. CAMPBELL: That is right, sir.

11 MR. ESTEY: So the ones on the job are  
12 given to people on the job. They are being paid, I take  
13 it?

14 MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

15 MR. ESTEY: And the ones in the evening may  
16 or may not be paid, you wouldn't know?

17 MR. CAMPBELL: I wouldn't know.

18 MR. ESTEY: Let us deal with the evening  
19 instruction. Is that given in more than one centre in  
20 Ontario?

21 MR. CAMPBELL: It is given in any centre  
22 that we can organize the trades.

23 MR. ESTEY: Let us deal with 1966. Would  
24 you give most of the courses here in Toronto, or are they  
25 evenly spread through the main districts of southern  
26 Ontario?

27 MR. SAMPSON: We have run some one hundred  
28 and sixty to one hundred and seventy-five courses every  
29 month.

30 MR. ESTEY: What do you mean by a course?





Nethercut & Young

2809

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. SAMPSON: We have a series of courses,  
2 sir. A basic introductory course which is about a three  
3 hour course. This is given to a group of men and there  
4 is discussed basic fundamentals, some psychology and what  
5 it is all about. From there they graduate through a "C"  
6 course, a "B" course and an "A" course. We carry them  
7 further and further and further.

8 MR. ESTEY: There are three hours in the  
9 introduction, how many in "C", "B" and in "A"?

10 MR. SAMPSON: The "C" course is eight hours.  
11 The "B" course is sixteen hours and the "A" course would  
12 run around three days about twenty-four hours.

13 MR. ESTEY: All evening courses?

14 MR. SAMPSON: These are largely evening,  
15 but more and more we are securing daytime courses at the  
16 contractor's expense on the job, where he may close a  
17 job down by noon and they gather at a local motel or meet-  
18 ing room somewhere, and go through to five o'clock.

19 MR. ESTEY: Is there much of that done?

20 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, this is increasing great-  
21 ly.

22 MR. ESTEY: For all kinds of contractors,  
23 electrical contractors, mechanical contractors, sub-con-  
24 tractors and general contractors?

25 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir, the whole gamut. It  
26 is general as you mentioned.

27 MR. ESTEY: I take it your association in-  
28 cludes the fabrication end of a steel company?

29 MR. SAMPSON: That is right.

30 MR. ESTEY: These courses which you give





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2810

1 are they given by the fourteen instructors Mr. Campbell  
2 mentioned a moment ago?

3 MR. SAMPSON: That is right.

4 MR. ESTEY: Where are the instructors lo-  
5 cated?

6 MR. SAMPSON: They all work out of Toronto,  
7 with the exception of two, who teach in different lan-  
8 guages and whom we have not on a full payroll basis, but  
9 we have trained them and we pay them on a per diem basis  
10 when required.

11 MR. ESTEY: What languages?

12 MR. SAMPSON: Portugese and French at the  
13 moment.

14 MR. ESTEY: No Italian?

15 MR. SAMPSON: Italian, we have two full  
16 time instructors on the staff who teach Italian.

17 MR. ESTEY: Two of the fourteen teach  
18 Italian?

19 MR. SAMPSON: Right.

20 MR. ESTEY: In addition, you have the part-  
21 time people who teach in Portugese and in French?

22 MR. SAMPSON: That is right.

23 MR. ESTEY: But your big foreign language  
24 on posters is Italian?

25 MR. SAMPSON: That is right. We estimate  
26 roughly fifty percent of the labour force are of Italian  
27 origin.

28 MR. ESTEY: I take it you print your posters  
29 in Italian, in some cases?

30 MR. SAMPSON: Right.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2811

1 MR. ESTEY: Do you run your television  
2 announcements in Italian?

3 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir.

4 MR. ESTEY: And the newspapers?

5 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir. We use Italian  
6 newspapers and we buy, wherever we can, Italian radio and  
7 television wherever they are available, and the courses  
8 run from the Quebec border to the Manitoba border. Our  
9 men are moving constantly.

10 MR. ESTEY: To get to the courses. The men  
11 are all based in Toronto but they go where the audience  
12 is?

13 MR. SAMPSON: That is right.

14 MR. ESTEY: In Toronto, are the evening  
15 courses given down on Victoria Street?

16 MR. SAMPSON: Largely now, since last Dec-  
17 ember, when we moved into our new quarters where we have  
18 proper accommodation. The accommodation is used every  
19 night of the week practically. Sometimes two and three  
20 of the available halls on our floor are used at night.

21 MR. ESTEY: I take it the great advantage  
22 of bringing the people into the Metro area is because  
23 you have motion pictures and blackboards and so on?

24 MR. SAMPSON: We have all that with us. If  
25 we go to Kapuskasing we take that with us.

26 MR. ESTEY: You have the sound and para-  
27 phernalia and stage and give the course in some employer's  
28 facility?

29 MR. SAMPSON: This year we have been ex-  
30 ceedingly fortunate. We budgeted this year, as I recall,





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2812

1        thirty-five thousand for rental of halls. We have not  
2        spent twelve thousand dollars in that area. We put on  
3        a drive to get free halls and we are getting free halls.  
4        You would be amazed at the type of people giving us free  
5        space.

6                    MR. ESTEY: In the routine of your opera-  
7        tions I would take it you administer these courses pre-  
8        dominately in the Toronto area, the Hamilton area and  
9        London area. In the largest centres of population you  
10      would have most of the construction conducted?

11                  MR. SAMPSON: That is right. Fifty percent  
12      of the construction and labour force are in York and  
13      Wentworth counties.

14                  MR. ESTEY: What do you do for the large  
15      projects such as Ontario Hydro?

16                  MR. SAMPSON: We don't get involved with  
17      Ontario Hydro. They have their own separate association.

18                  MR. ESTEY: What about contractors working  
19      with the Ontario Hydro, what do you do with them?

20                  MR. SAMPSON: We work with them, but there  
21      are very few contractors working for Hydro, but those that  
22      do we work with them.

23                  MR. ESTEY: That applies generally where  
24      the owner of the property may not be in the construction  
25      industry, but who may be and not covered by the Act? If  
26      he lets the work to a contractor that is part of your  
27      membership?

28                  MR. SAMPSON: All contractors whoever they  
29      work for. Yes.

30                  MR. ESTEY: Moving down the page you come





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2813

1 to management counsel, one hundred and twelve thousand  
2 dollars last year, and up thirty-five thousand to about  
3 one hundred and forty-five thousand, what is that?

4 MR. SAMPSON: We are going to extend that  
5 a little.

6 MR. ESTEY: What does that department do?

7 MR. SAMPSON: The management counsellors  
8 are salesmen who have been trained to contact the direc-  
9 tors on a daily basis and their purpose in life is to  
10 try to persuade the contractors number one, on their  
11 moral responsibility within the industry as far as a  
12 man's safety is concerned, and number two, to make sure  
13 they are aware of the acts in our province that dictate  
14 the laws of safety. Number three, to encourage them to  
15 encourage their work force to attend our educational  
16 courses. Number four, to establish or endeavour to es-  
17 tablish within those contractors' companies proper safety  
18 programmes and try to --

19 MR. ESTEY: How many of those management  
20 counsellors do you have?

21 MR. SAMPSON: Ten.

22 MR. ESTEY: Where are they based?

23 MR. SAMPSON: Six are in Toronto and four  
24 outside. One is at Ottawa, one is at Sudbury, one at the  
25 Lakehead and one at Kingston. The six are out of the  
26 Toronto office.

27 MR. ESTEY: None within western Ontario?  
28 None at Windsor, Sarnia and London?

29 MR. SAMPSON: No, we work that out of  
30 Toronto.





Nethercut & Young

2814

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. ESTEY: Now that budget is increased,  
2 I take it, you will increase the staff in 1967?

3 MR. SAMPSON: Right.

4 MR. ESTEY: And I take it you found this is  
5 a very effective way to introduce safety measures to the  
6 work force?

7 MR. SAMPSON: That is right.

8 MR. ESTEY: By persuading the employers to  
9 stage the campaigns to support the campaigns and give  
10 you the free halls and all you need?

11 MR. SAMPSON: That is right. Since the  
12 inception of Section 86(6)(A) of the Workmen's Compensation  
13 Act --

14 MR. ESTEY: That pushes people along a  
15 little bit? That raises another great topic. Do you  
16 have any construction codes of safety you disseminate to  
17 your work forces and companies?

18 MR. SAMPSON: Yes we do. We have a very  
19 wide and broad library of what we call maximum safety  
20 methods.

21 MR. ESTEY: I avoid the word "regulation"  
22 but it is a convenient word. Do you have a code of dir-  
23 ections or a manual of safety procedures?

24 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir.

25 MR. ESTEY: What do you call it?

26 MR. SAMPSON: The Construction Safety Book  
27 which will be off the press within the next ten days.  
28 This book was created this year and this book has gather-  
29 ed together most of the safety code books we have under  
one cover. We have safety code books for practically all





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2715

1 of the factors of our industry: Painting and decorating,  
2 steel and so on, highway and road building.

3 MR. ESTEY: A separate booklet for each  
4 industry?

5 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir.

6 MR. ESTEY: Do those booklets include the  
7 regulations under the Construction Safety Act?

8 MR. SAMPSON: No they do not. Not those  
9 books. In one or two we have we refer to the Construc-  
10 tion Safety Act and in much of our courses we teach and  
11 use a good deal of the regulations in the Construction  
12 Safety Act and so on. These are the actual laws.

13 MR. ESTEY: Do any of the instructions  
14 consist of educating the workmen and supervisors in the  
15 legal standards they are to conform to?

16 MR. SAMPSON: That is right, and we have  
17 a course in addition to that. We have a manual of safe  
18 procedures which incorporates any regulations adopted by  
19 the departments concerned, departments of government.

20 MR. ESTEY: Does the code include provisions  
21 your industry has found helpful in improving safety stan-  
22 dards?

23 MR. SAMPSON: Right. They are really the  
24 maximum, whereas the Construction Safety Act, for example,  
25 is basic safety.

26 MR. ESTEY: Things you must do on a manda-  
27 tory basis?

28 MR. SAMPSON: Right. We go further than  
29 that.

30 MR. ESTEY: Your code is the desirable or





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1 optimum?

2 MR. SAMPSON: This is the minister in the  
3 pulpit when talking to his congregation who says if you  
4 move outside you have certain laws but they are not as  
5 high in their requirements as the minister would like  
6 from the pulpit.

7 MR. ESTEY: I don't know that I like it  
8 but it seems to be a good parallel.

9 MR. SAMPSON: Well, it is earthy anyway.

10 MR. ESTEY: These regulations and construc-  
11 tion codes you have, have they any force in law?

12 MR. SAMPSON: No, sir.

13 MR. ESTEY: When your people travel around,  
14 your fourteen instructors and ten counsellors, and next  
15 year more, some twenty-four to thirty people, I take it,  
16 when they observe breaches of the voluntary safety codes  
17 would they draw the management's attention to it?

18 MR. SAMPSON: That is right, and in the  
19 odd case where we do find these things, they will even  
20 communicate with the local inspector.

21 MR. ESTEY: You are talking now of the  
22 Department of Labour's inspector?

23 MR. SAMPSON: Or the municipal inspector.

24 MR. ESTEY: The building inspector?

25 MR. SAMPSON: Yes.

26 MR. ESTEY: Do you have any formal method  
27 of liaison with the two levels of government, municipal  
28 and provincial?

29 MR. SAMPSON: No, but we have a co-operative  
30 one.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

1617

1                   THE COMMISSIONER: A co-operative liaison,  
2 what is the difference between that and formal liaison?

3                   MR. SAMPSON: May we define a formal liaison?  
4 What shall we mean by formal liaison?

5                   MR. ESTEY: Do you have some regular meet-  
6 ings with the department to exchange information about  
7 plans and construction sites your people have inspected,  
8 and you turn reports over to the Department of Labour?

9                   MR. SAMPSON: We don't inspect sites, so we  
10 have no real reason to liaison with the Department of  
11 Labour in that area.

12                  MR. ESTEY: I thought you had to see that  
13 they were following the principles of the construction  
14 code?

15                  MR. SAMPSON: We do not.

16                  MR. ESTEY: It is just a casual inspection?

17                  MR. SAMPSON: Our job is educational and  
18 not inspection.

19                  MR. ESTEY: When your twenty-four to thirty  
20 men go on the job do they observe the procedures actually  
21 in effect?

22                  MR. SAMPSON: Let me go back just a moment.  
23 The educational department are a busy group and not always  
24 on construction sites. They are busy daytime and evening  
25 putting on educational courses for groups of construction  
26 men. They spend very little time on construction sites.

27                  MR. ESTEY: Who gives the instructions on  
28 the construction sites you told me about earlier?

29                  MR. SAMPSON: Where we are required or able  
30 to sell a contractor to put on a course on an on the job





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2818

1 site.

2 MR. ESTEY: In those occasions he would be  
3 on the site, but generally speaking you are saying your  
4 field men don't go on a regular basis to construction  
5 projects?

6 MR. SAMPSON: Absolutely.

7 MR. ESTEY: They administer the instruction  
8 away from the projects, but on occasion they do this on  
9 the site itself?

10 MR. SAMPSON: That is right.

11 MR. ESTEY: Is that because of the nature of  
12 construction as opposed to manufacturing, that there are  
13 no facilities on a construction site?

14 MR. SAMPSON: A little over four years ago  
15 the function of the Construction Safety Association was  
16 one of safety counselling, and the Association had a mov-  
17 ing staff of twenty to twenty-five safety counsellors  
18 whose job was to visit construction sites throughout the  
19 Province of Ontario, and they would inspect these jobs  
20 from top to bottom.

21 MR. ESTEY: How long ago was this?

22 MR. SAMPSON: Almost five years ago, just  
23 prior to the inception of the Construction Safety Act, in  
24 August, 1962. Their function was to inspect these con-  
25 struction sites and to fill out a survey report and note  
26 unsafe conditions or any unsafe act they might see. Then  
27 they would draw this to the attention of the superintendent  
28 on the project, leave a copy and get him to sign this.  
29 They would leave a copy with him and a copy was mailed to  
30 the contractor at the head office and a copy was mailed to





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

7-129

1 our office. The function there was again one of persuasion  
2 and education, if you will, to draw to the attention  
3 of the contractor the unsafe conditions on the site, and  
4 ask them to remedy these immediately. With an average  
5 force of some twenty to twenty-five men, with perhaps  
6 approximately three to four thousand construction jobs  
7 all going on daily in the Province of Ontario, which is  
8 about average, this would spread twenty to twenty-five  
9 men very thin, so that the frequency of visiting per job  
10 site would be six to eight to ten to twelve weeks.

11 MR. ESTEY: Some construction projects only  
12 last that long so you would never make it to those sites?

13 MR. SAMPSON: That is right. There would  
14 be boys and girls working in there now but not on construc-  
15 tion.

16 MR. ESTEY: How long was that practice  
17 followed?

18 MR. SAMPSON: Perhaps since the formation  
19 of the safety association around 1929 and 30.

20 MR. ESTEY: And it was discontinued?

21 MR. SAMPSON: It was discontinued within  
22 six to nine months after the inception of the Construction  
23 Safety Act, and we swung over completely to the educational  
24 side.

25 MR. ESTEY: And you left inspection to the  
26 municipalities and Department of Labour?

27 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir. We found for ex-  
28 ample in the early months there were two different con-  
29 flicting people on the job. For example, the safety in-  
30 spector would visit the job and find an association





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1      inspector. One had authority and one had no authority.  
2      There was an overlap that didn't make sense.

3                    MR. ESTEY: So from that time on, 1961 or  
4      62, or somewhere in that region, you have been wholly in  
5      the educational side of safety and not the enforcement  
6      side at all?

7                    MR. SAMPSON: That is right, sir.

8                    MR. ESTEY: Does the Department of Labour  
9      run any safety films or seminars or instruction for super-  
10     visory people?

11                  MR. SAMPSON: I couldn't answer that too  
12     knowledgeably. I know they run their own safety seminars  
13     for municipal and county inspectors throughout the pro-  
14     vince on a regular basis. I can't answer intelligently  
15     whether they run courses for supervisors.

16                  MR. ESTEY: Do you know if the federal  
17     labour department has any safety programme?

18                  MR. SAMPSON: I am unaware of them.

19                  MR. ESTEY: Moving down your page, you come  
20     to the analytical item which went from forty-five hundred  
21     dollars in 1966 to one hundred and two thousand for next  
22     year.

23                  MR. SAMPSON: That is the proposal, sir.

24                  MR. ESTEY: What does that department do?

25                  MR. SAMPSON: That department was created  
26     in the past year, in an attempt to try and learn in ad-  
27     vance where the malpractices were in the construction in-  
28     dustry that frequency ended up in tragedy. The construct-  
29     ion industry is like other industries; perhaps more so.  
30     Tradition plays a big part in the construction industry.





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1071

1 and you find if there has been a fatality or serious in-  
2 jury caused by an unsafe condition, it is one of those  
3 things where, if you ask the man on the job, the construc-  
4 tion superintendent or the foreman, why wasn't this done  
5 or that done, the answer usually is -- and very honestly  
6 is -- "We don't do it that way. This is the way we have  
7 been doing it for fifty years."

8 There are quite a lot of these conditions  
9 and in an attempt to try and head them off, we started  
10 to develop this department to study construction sites  
11 and study plans in advance, to see whether a construction  
12 practise might end up in failure, a human failure.

13 MR. ESTEY: Did I hear you rightly? You  
14 study plans in advance?

15 MR. SAMPSON: Yes. Remember this is just a  
16 start this year. We started with one engineer on our  
17 staff and he would go to contractors, to their work shacks  
18 and offices, and sit down and talk to them and find out  
19 how things would be done.

20 MR. ESTEY: Is he a civil engineer?

21 MR. SAMPSON: A civil engineer. Our objec-  
22 tive was to learn in advance what practice might be used,  
23 or is being used in the industry, on the chance lady luck  
24 might work for a long time but then might fail. When we  
25 found this kind of condition, our purpose and objective  
26 was to publish this to the industry to say this practise,  
27 while used for fifty years is condemned for these reasons,  
28 and this is the way this function should be accomplished.

29 MR. ESTEY: The United States Federal Agency  
30 does the same thing in federal contracting. It issues





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1968-10-10

1 pamphlets and publications of safety procedures for pour-  
2 ing cement, and safe procedures for setting rods, and so  
3 on.

4 MR. SAMPSON: I am not too aware of it, but  
5 I would assume it did.

6 MR. ESTEY: You get these plans on a volun-  
7 tary basis from your members?

8 MR. SAMPSON: This is the objective, but we  
9 only started with one man.

10 MR. ESTEY: What about next year?

11 MR. SAMPSON: We plan next year to carry  
12 this on. We have worked this year with the chimney con-  
13 tractors. This is a relatively small group in the indus-  
14 try, from a payroll point of view, but rather a dangerous  
15 part of the industry. We have had several fatalities in  
16 the construction of high-rise chimneys three or four hun-  
17 dred feet high, and we have the problem of how do you get  
18 men up and down. They have been using practises for many  
19 years and get away with relatively few fatalities, but we  
20 work closely with them and there are only seven, eight or  
21 nine of those in the province. We are trying to get some  
22 kind of regulation or some change in the practise which  
23 they use.

24 MR. ESTEY: You are not talking about regu-  
25 lations in the sense of persuading the Department of Labour  
26 to bring out new legislation?

27 MR. SAMPSON: Yes. In this particular case  
28 there were a series of meetings, which ended up with a  
29 series of regulations suggested and submitted to the  
30 Department of Labour, and forwarded to the Minister of





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1 Labour for consideration as inclusions in any revisions of  
2 the Act.

3 MR. ESTEY: These proposals you have passed  
4 to the Department, these are not made by the analytical  
5 section but the association generally, I take it. You  
6 have been making these proposals on an informal basis for  
7 some time?

8 MR. SAMPSON: Not too frequently.

9 MR. ESTEY: Will this type of effort be en-  
10 hanced and increased by the analytical section employment  
11 of professional men?

12 MR. SAMPSON: Hopefully. We are in, like  
13 many other people, in a big uncharted area. We are talk-  
14 ing people. Human people.

15 MR. ESTEY: Is there any duplication of  
16 effort in what you describe, with your work with the civil  
17 engineer, is there an overlap with what the Department of  
18 Labour do in this same field?

19 MR. SAMPSON: I couldn't answer that too  
20 positively. I could say I doubt it, but I couldn't be  
21 positive.

22 MR. ESTEY: Let us take a practical example.  
23 The bridge that fell in Ottawa. A reinforced concrete  
24 bridge collapsed when the concrete was setting. The De-  
25 partment of Labour investigated it, the Department of  
26 Transport investigated it, the Federal Government investi-  
27 gated it and I suppose your analytical department went  
28 down to see why the forms fell in?

29 MR. SAMPSON: We are really not involved in  
30 this. We went down. Our engineer went down as an observer.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2824

1 It was rather late when we did this and it was all over  
2 when he got there.

3 MR. ESTEY: This is the kind of thing you  
4 would seek to establish some kind of know how and circu-  
5 late to your members, so it won't happen again. Not in  
6 the form of a binding regulation, although you might sell  
7 it to the Department of Labour, but as a precautionary  
8 notice to the contractors, such as you send to the chimney  
9 contractors?

10 MR. SAMPSON: That is right.

11 MR. ESTEY: You say it is preventive educa-  
12 tion, not obligatory or legislative rules at all?

13 MR. SAMPSON: That is right. We have been  
14 working with the silo contractors. There are quite a  
15 number of hundreds of silos built every year. Maybe we  
16 think the agricultural side of the economy is dwindling,  
17 but the silos are getting bigger this way (indicates) and  
18 (this way). This again is in effect a chimney construc-  
19 tion.

20 MR. ESTEY: Fewer and fewer are being made  
21 by the farmer himself, but more by contractors?

22 MR. SAMPSON: That is right. Most are begun  
23 by contractors. They want to move in quickly and move out  
24 quickly with a substantial profit, and that is what they  
25 are in business for, but the question again is how do you  
26 get men up and down safely. Those are the kind of factors  
27 we are looking for. We have had some fatalities this  
28 year in Ontario in silo construction. We are working with  
29 these people in an inquisitive and curious way. We are  
30 asking, "why are you doing it this way, there has to be





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2825

1 a better way." We get all the negatives and try to be  
2 positive about it.

3 MR. ESTEY: We are interested in the possi-  
4 bility that you are overlapping with the rural county, the  
5 municipal inspection and the Department of Labour inspect-  
6 ion, and Department of Labour enforcement agencies?

7 MR. SAMPSON: If we find we are overlapping  
8 I certainly wouldn't want to encourage that, but at the  
9 county inspector level, I may be wrong so forgive me, but  
10 at the county or municipal inspector level I think that  
11 man's purpose in life is to see that the construction laws  
12 are observed. I doubt very much if he has the time to  
13 sit down and ask these people to find out what they might  
14 be doing wrong. This is quite a time consuming task.

15 MR. ESTEY: You are interested in and, to  
16 take a practical example, a reinforced concrete building,  
17 it is not whether the building is built in accordance with  
18 the filed plans or the building permit, but whether or  
19 not the contractor is using the safest manner of, say for  
20 example, cutting the rods off on the top of the building?

21 MR. SAMPSON: That is right.

22 MR. ESTEY: The Department of Labour inspec-  
23 tors would not be interested so long as the crane was  
24 licensed and the area underneath was screened to the public,  
25 or so long as they didn't use it over hydro lines or over  
26 a certain wind velocity. The Department of Labour is  
27 interested in those, but your engineer is interested in  
28 whether your association can form a code as to how they  
29 move these?

30 MR. SAMPSON: That is right. We get all





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2826

1 the chimney contractors, the top personnel together, and  
2 we say, "Here is what happens, now why? How did you do  
3 it? Why did you do it? Why have you been doing it this  
4 way? Surely this is inadequate. Gentlemen, we have to  
5 be modern. You have to change your fabrication process  
6 and you have to be more conscious of the safety of men."  
7 You will get other arguments, yes. They will say, "it will  
8 cost more money." We are not interested in money but men.

9 MR. ESTEY: Doesn't the Department of Labour  
10 do the same thing every time they investigate a fatality?

11 MR. SAMPSON: I am not too sure they would  
12 call all the contractors in. I am not sure.

13 MR. ESTEY: Would you receive reports of  
14 claims from the construction industry?

15 MR. SAMPSON: We receive daily from the  
16 Workmen's Compensation Board the notices of injury which  
17 are claims in our industry, on a daily basis, in our  
18 office.

19 MR. ESTEY: What do you do with it?

20 MR. SAMPSON: We put them in a monster, our  
21 computer machine, and we are becoming more knowledgeable  
22 and smarter as we are learning. We are finding information  
23 in a more instant manner. For example here is a monthly  
24 report that we should get now, with this information taken  
25 from all the Workmen's Compensation Board memos we receive  
26 daily.

27 MR. ESTEY: Is that report you are referring  
28 to, Mr. Sampson, made by your association or delivered by  
29 the Board?

30 MR. SAMPSON: The information comes from the





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2827

1 Board. The Board receives the information from the em-  
2 ployer. The employer has to report to the Board with our  
3 lost time injuries. This comes to us on a daily basis  
4 from the Board. At the end of the month, or weekly, we  
5 get this information in the manner in which we require it  
6 and we send it to a computer organization who, at the end  
7 of the month, turn over to us the history and we know  
8 instantly, at the end of the month, the total number of  
9 accidents and the nature of the injury. We know the cause  
10 of the injury. We know the age groups of those who are  
11 injured. We know the type of person, labourers, mechanics,  
12 and what they are. We know that at the end of September  
13 four hundred and ninety-nine labourers were injured this  
14 year.

15 MR. ESTEY: What do you do with the report?

16 MR. SAMPSON: This information is turned  
17 over immediately to our management counsellors.

18 MR. ESTEY: Do you give that report to the  
19 Department of Labour safety section also?

20 MR. SAMPSON: No, sir.

21 MR. ESTEY: What part of your budget do you  
22 find the computer cost in?

23 MR. SAMPSON: The analytical department.

24 MR. ESTEY: That is part of the increase  
25 for 1967?

26 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir.

27 MR. ESTEY: Does the Workmen's Compensation  
28 Board's big computer turn out this same information?

29 MR. SAMPSON: No, sir. Not yet. I think  
30 the Workmen's Compensation Board, will do this as part of





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2529

1 their future operations, and I am sure as soon as they  
2 can would perhaps want to do this kind of thing.

3 MR. ESTEY: You contract this out right now?

4 MR. SAMPSON: At the moment, we contract it  
5 out.

6 MR. ESTEY: You don't go back to the Board?

7 MR. SAMPSON: At the present time they are  
8 unable to handle this. They have many other problems and  
9 loads.

10 MR. ESTEY: On the use of the report, you  
11 put it back out to the industry through twenty-five to  
12 thirty field representatives, the management counsellors?

13 MR. SAMPSON: The management counsellors.  
14 We have, for example, the contractor's name and the total  
15 number of injuries. We put sort of red flags on them.

16 MR. ESTEY: You ride herd on the contractor  
17 who has the highest frequency of accident rating?

18 MR. SAMPSON: After the ones with the greatest  
19 number of injuries, and we constantly go after them  
20 and we give him a copy. We pull a copy and we say,  
21 "What is wrong? Where is it wrong? You have had 'X'  
22 number of injuries here from nails puncturing shoes. Are  
23 you not insisting your men wear safety shoes?"

24 MR. ESTEY: Somewhere back you mentioned  
25 the effect of 86 (6) (A). Do you have a bridge across to  
26 that person?

27 MR. SAMPSON: No, we are advised by the  
28 Board of those employers who will be, or are going to be  
29 notified of double assessment under 86 (6) (A).

30 MR. ESTEY: What do you do when you get that





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2829

1 information?

2 MR. SAMPSON: When we get that information  
3 we take the worst offenders and say, "you look like you're  
4 in the soup."

5 MR. ESTEY: You do the same with that as  
6 you do with your book, I take it?

7 MR. SAMPSON: That is right.

8 MR. ESTEY: All a part of your method of  
9 field safety education?

10 MR. SAMPSON: And persuasion.

11 MR. ESTEY: Backed up by a double assess-  
12 ment quota which hangs over their head, if they don't get  
13 into the programme.

14 MR. SAMPSON: This is serious if they are  
15 double assessed. They have to take it out of the top  
16 drawer. It is too late to put it in a bid price. You  
17 can't recover the money. It has a salutary effect.

18 MR. ESTEY: What is the rate these contract-  
19 ors pay in assessment. What kind of rates?

20 MR. SAMPSON: We have ten rates, eleven  
21 rates.

22 MR. ESTEY: How do they range?

23 MR. SAMPSON: The general average subcontractor pays three dollars and fifty cents per hundred of  
24 payroll.

25 MR. ESTEY: Do you happen to know the  
26 numbers off hand?

27 MR. SAMPSON: Not only off hand. I can give  
28 them to you exactly. 736, 744, 753, 809, 744 --

29 MR. ESTEY: 809 through 873?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2350

1 MR. SAMPSON: 809, 827, 836, 854, 839, 864,  
2 873 and 943.

3 MR. ESTEY: And 844 I think?

4 MR. SAMPSON: 844, no. That is in our  
5 industry but a very minor inclusion.

6 MR. ESTEY: And the rate actually paid runs,  
7 Mr. Sampson, in what range?

8 MR. SAMPSON: The average rate?

9 MR. ESTEY: Yes.

10 MR. SAMPSON: I would assume that the aver-  
11 age rate is three fifty, because it is the largest part  
12 of our membership.

13 MR. ESTEY: Three dollars and fifty cents?

14 MR. SAMPSON: The highest rate is in demo-  
15 lition or the wrecking business.

16 MR. ESTEY: Your highest rate is in what?

17 MR. SAMPSON: Wrecking or demolition. That  
18 is fifteen percent. Steel erection is twelve percent.

19 MR. ESTEY: Fifteen percent, I take it, on  
20 the basis of experience in the wrecking employment rates?

21 MR. SAMPSON: Some time ago the Workmen's  
22 Compensation Board broke the records for demolition people  
23 away from the general trades, because they are a smaller  
24 group and incurred --

25 MR. ESTEY: Incurred large claims and the  
26 frequency was high?

27 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, and the Board moved them  
28 in a separate area and increased their rate.

29 MR. ESTEY: What do you do in your education  
30 work with the demolition people? Do you spend much time





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2831

1 with them?

2 MR. SAMPSON: Yes. We do. We work directly  
3 with the Department and those people.

4 MR. ESTEY: Do you find the incidence of  
5 claims in the demolition field is higher in the big cities  
6 than the smaller places, where the buildings are higher?

7 MR. SAMPSON: I couldn't answer that. We  
8 are not sophisticated enough yet in the refinements of  
9 this. It would be, I would guess, higher in Toronto.

10 MR. ESTEY: <sup>a</sup> We have/brief from one in King-  
11 ston who says he has always overpaid because he is carry-  
12 ing on his back the Toronto and big city contractors, who  
13 are on higher buildings and hire more people. His figures  
14 support what he says.

15 MR. SAMPSON: I can't voice an opinion that  
16 would have any intelligence behind it, sir.

17 MR. CAMPBELL: It is quite possible in a  
18 smaller community that somebody would get the job with-  
19 out experience, and you would have drastic problems. Some  
20 of the well trained demolition contractors down here  
21 would do a pretty respectable job. If someone entered  
22 into it without experience because there hadn't been that  
23 style of work it could create trouble. You just have to  
24 be a lot better or you will find you can get into serious  
25 trouble quickly.

26 MR. ESTEY: You say there are more factors  
27 than the height of the building?

28 MR. CAMPBELL: Oh yes. I would imagine  
29 some of the fellows can take down a high-rise with a  
30 certain method and do it well.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2832

1                   MR. ESTEY: I see. Well then, moving along  
2 in your budget you have a substantial item in 1966 of  
3 six hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars for adver-  
4 tising and public relations, and I take it that is what  
5 it says. It is newspaper, T.V. and radio advertising and  
6 what else?

7                   MR. SAMPSON: Well salaries. We have trav-  
8 elling expenses and crusades.

9                   THE COMMISSIONER: What is the last item?

10                  MR. SAMPSON: Crusades. We tried, gentle-  
11 men, this year two of what we call construction safety  
one.  
12 crusades/in the month of May in the City of Toronto. We  
13 had the month of May declared construction safety month  
14 by the mayor of the city, and we used all the paraphe-  
15 nalia of a promotion to create attention. We did it  
16 jointly with organized labour and we kicked it off at the  
17 Inn on the Park, with an audience of over two hundred  
18 people of which fifty percent were labour representatives.  
19 The labour crusade was done jointly for the month of May.  
20 We feel we certainly created attention, but we have no  
21 way of knowing whether or not we sold any goods. Only  
22 one way, and this is a thin one, the month of May lost  
23 time injuries was down over the month of April, down over  
24 the month of May a year ago and since the month of May,  
25 up until the end of September at this point, there has  
26 been a noticeable downward trend in injuries. Nothing  
27 startling but a downward trend, maybe fifty to seventy-  
28 five to a hundred injuries less per month, with one ex-  
29 ception and that is September when we were up fifty. This  
30 is one of the things our people would love to believe.





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1945

1 MR. ESTEY: This was jointly with management and labour?

2 MR. SAMPSON: Right.

3 MR. ESTEY: You don't have any provision  
4 for labour on your board of directors?

5 MR. SAMPSON: No. They had nothing to do  
6 with the crusade either. We have excellent relations  
7 with organized labour. We moved to Ottawa and had a bet-  
8 ter opportunity and put on a crusade again with full co-  
9 operation of organized labour, but because Ottawa is a  
10 smaller community we were able to move into Ottawa in ad-  
11 vance on a count and recount basis. We learned eighty  
12 percent of the construction in Ottawa was performed by  
13 "X" number of contractors so we worked very closely. We  
14 got the lost time injuries for the three months prior to  
15 May, and we got them a year earlier, and we put on the  
16 crusade in Ottawa during the month of May this year, and  
17 after the smoke was all over and we went back on our count  
18 and recount, we learned we had reduced injuries in Ottawa  
19 by forty percent for that month.

20 MR. ESTEY: Which part of the budget does  
21 that programme come under?

22 MR. SAMPSON: Advertising and public re-  
23 lations.

24 MR. ESTEY: You say you did that with the  
25 co-operation of labour in Ottawa. How many unions were  
26 connected with your association?

27 MR. SAMPSON: Eighty-five.

28 MR. ESTEY: How do you do it, with trades  
29 and labour?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2834

1 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir. We are working with  
2 the Hamilton Trades and Labour Council for a safety cru-  
3 sade in Hamilton, after the turn of the year. We get  
4 tremendous support from the trade unions in this area. In  
5 Toronto in the month of May, during the safety crusade,  
6 because we didn't have this kind of staff we had some,  
7 I think, eighty to ninety business agents of the local  
8 construction trade unions who went around and put up our  
9 posters.

10 MR. ESTEY: Do you ever have any suggestions  
11 made to the association that it would be helpful in in-  
12 augurating steps to solve joint problems, to have some  
13 formal link with the trade people other than you now have?

14 MR. SAMPSON: Suggestions? No, I have heard  
15 all kinds of suggestions and some threats, but oh, yes,  
16 I have heard it, but whether or not it is a good thing I  
17 am not prepared to say. I am a paid employee.

18 MR. ESTEY: Perhaps I should ask Mr. Camp-  
19 bell?

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps it is not a fair  
21 question to put to you.

22 MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Sampson has done an ex-  
23 cellent job in everything he has been able to speak to.

24 MR. ESTEY: I put the question --

25 MR. CAMPBELL: The attitude of the Board  
26 of Directors of the Construction Safety Association is  
27 that they feel they can handle the problem of running a  
28 safety association quite well themselves, and their feel-  
29 ing is it is part of their own association. They are  
30 getting part of their own money back to run the association





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2835

1 by those who should be running it.

2 MR. ESTEY: And you get your liaison or  
3 relationship of what you think is a successful but albeit  
4 less formal way?

5 MR. CAMPBELL: I don't think there was any  
6 real attempt on either side of labour and management to  
7 actually get out and co-operate and do something until  
8 the last couple of years. I can only talk about what I  
9 am aware of. The employees of our association went out  
10 and I, as a director, have gone out with the word that  
11 on the topic of safety we will try to co-operate with any  
12 one soul or group, whether management or labour. We have  
13 one job and that is to reduce accidents.

14 MR. ESTEY: You are a general contractor?

15 MR. CAMPBELL: No, I am a road contractor.

16 MR. ESTEY: Is this your first term of  
17 president?

18 MR. CAMPBELL: It will be the first and  
19 last. We are elected one term at a time.

20 MR. ESTEY: I want to dwell for a moment,  
21 while you are on your feet, I agree you are the one to  
22 answer, you have been vice-president?

23 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.

24 MR. ESTEY: And a director for some time?

25 MR. CAMPBELL: For three years.

26 MR. ESTEY: How many directors do you have?

27 MR. CAMPBELL: Fifty-seven.

28 MR. ESTEY: They are scattered geographically?

29 MR. CAMPBELL: They are first of all scat-  
30 tered through the rating groups of the companies, right,





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2836

1 and secondly geographically.

2 MR. ESTEY: Through the rates groups under  
3 the 21, 22, 23 class?

4 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

5 MR. ESTEY: Do you break them down so the  
6 mechanical subcontractors have so many directors and the  
7 electrical have so many directors?

8 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. In other words we are  
9 trying to get the greatest spread possible.

10 MR. ESTEY: And the road builders would  
11 have some representation on the board?

12 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

13 MR. ESTEY: General contractors would pre-  
14 dominate?

15 MR. CAMPBELL: The general contractors and  
16 what is classified sub-trades are the predominate direc-  
17 tors.

18 MR. ESTEY: Do you have any sub-associations?  
19 We heard in the I.A.P.A., they have nine of them. Do you  
20 have sub-groupings, so the electrical can get their  
21 training without being mixed with the plumbers?

22 MR. CAMPBELL: We have specific films and  
23 courses given to sub-groups, but no sub-groups in the  
24 organization.

25 MR. ESTEY: The reason I ask you, as a rank  
26 outsider, it would seem to me that the journeyman elec-  
27 trician has little in common in safety procedures with a  
28 tile layer. One is dealing with lethal doses of electri-  
29 city and the other is down on the ground floor in a build-

30





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2837

1 ing in a different set of circumstances. You lump those  
2 together for your safety courses, do you?

3 MR. CAMPBELL: That is right.

4 MR. ESTEY: But you have specialist train-  
5 ing in course "A", "B" and "C", the electrical people  
6 getting different films than the other people get when  
7 you complete your different courses?

8 MR. CAMPBELL: That is right.

9 MR. ESTEY: There is no pressure, no sug-  
10 gestion, no movement to organize sub-associations to group  
11 together, those who have skills more or less in common?

12 MR. CAMPBELL: I am not aware of any pres-  
13 sure from any group of contractors. Let us put it that  
14 way.

15 MR. ESTEY: You read in the paper electri-  
16 cians get electrocuted so they have to wear safety devices  
17 unique to their trade. They have to know certain things  
18 about the trade, particularly how they step off a grounded  
19 or ungrounded vehicle and a terazzo floor layer would  
20 never have to know that, but the electrician if he forgets  
21 it is dead. It is not against the law to step off in any  
22 way, that is your right?

23 MR. CAMPBELL: That is right.

24 MR. ESTEY: Why don't you organize them  
25 separately from someone else?

26 MR. CAMPBELL: We do organize them separately,  
27 but not under pressure. I will give you a case in point.  
28 One of the electrical contractors is Ainsworth in the  
29 city, rather a large organization. We have had several  
30 educational courses strictly with their personnel, and





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2838

1 purely with the whole concept of construction safety in-  
2 cluding the Construction Safety Act and its requirements,  
3 as well as instruction to them on the electrical sites.

4 MR. ESTEY: So when the need of informing  
5 a certain group arises you beam it to the audience?

6 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.

7 MR. ESTEY: And the same applies to say,  
8 refrigeration?

9 MR. CAMPBELL: That is right, the cement  
10 masons and brick layers.

11 MR. ESTEY: The steel riggers?

12 MR. CAMPBELL: That is right. We are form-  
13 ally under Workmen's Compensation classifications. Class  
14 21 represents road builders, sewers and airport tarmac  
15 builders. "23" is steel erection or the iron working in-  
16 dustry, and Class 24 is the general contractor and sub-  
17 trades. These three were separate associations. In the  
18 last couple of years through the direction of the direc-  
19 tors, we have organized them under one. We don't have  
20 three separate meetings, three separate boards of direc-  
21 tors, three separate operations, they are all under the  
22 one association and we dropped the "s" from the word  
23 associations to association.

24 MR. ESTEY: What about the area group we  
25 have seen in the mining industry? They have geographic  
26 units so they can bring their people together more easily  
27 and frequently and they have more in common. Do you have  
28 that?

29 MR. CAMPBELL: No, sir. We don't have  
30 regional offices, we have area directors but not in a





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2839

1 formal way.

2 MR. ESTEY: I see that in the construction  
3 trades the employers grouped together in an almost end-  
4 less number of associations, and the construction associa-  
5 tion is simply a federation of associations and you have  
6 electrical contractors or what have you, everybody down  
7 to grave digger contractors?

8 MR. CAMPBELL: That is right.

9 MR. ESTEY: And all lumped together in one  
10 association?

11 MR. CAMPBELL: All in the one bag.

12 MR. ESTEY: You have fifty-seven directors,  
13 how often do they meet?

14 MR. CAMPBELL: A minimum of twice a year  
15 for a general directors' meeting; a minimum of three  
16 times a year on the general council meetings and the  
17 management directors' meeting is monthly, and sometimes  
18 more.

19 MR. ESTEY: You named three groups your  
20 by-laws cover. The directors who run the association  
21 and a larger group that meets less frequently and the  
22 big group of directors who number fifty-seven?

23 MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

24 MR. ESTEY: Do you ever have a meeting of  
25 the whole membership?

26 MR. CAMPBELL: You mean the twenty thousand?  
27 No, sir.

28 MR. ESTEY: Do you ever have a convention?

29 MR. CAMPBELL: No, sir. We have an annual  
30 meeting but not a convention.





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1 MR. ESTEY: At the annual meeting, how many  
2 people attend?

3 MR. CAMPBELL: Sixty to seventy to eighty.

4 MR. ESTEY: That is the one that elects  
5 the directors?

6 MR. CAMPBELL: That is right, but we legally  
7 have to circulate the twenty thousand members every year  
8 with proxies and the details. We get back a maximum of  
9 twelve to fourteen hundred, of which perhaps fifty to  
10 sixty percent aren't legally properly attested to or  
11 filled out.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: They have sought to fill  
13 them out but haven't done it correctly?

14 MR. CAMPBELL: Right. They haven't the  
15 company seal on, or the right person hasn't signed it or  
16 that sort of thing

17 MR. ESTEY: One of your reasons for this  
18 method of operating, I take it, is that in your member  
19 associations and there must be thirty of them, they all  
20 have their annual meeting and the directors go to those?

21 MR. CAMPBELL: That is right.

22 MR. ESTEY: Does your safety association  
23 conduct films or seminars of some kind?

24 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir. We are involved  
25 in various construction trade groups.

26 MR. ESTEY: Area groups inside the associa-  
27 tion?

28 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.

29 MR. ESTEY: That comes under the P.R.,  
30 budget also?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2841

1 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.

2 MR. ESTEY: And the last part of your P.R.,  
3 budget. How much of the advertising and public relations  
4 six hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars would go in-  
5 to the meetings under the public relations heading? How  
6 do you break that down?

7 MR. CAMPBELL: We don't break it down, per se.

8 MR. ESTEY: Perhaps it would be easier if I  
9 put it this way. How much do you spend on radio and T.V.?

10 MR. CAMPBELL: What we spend on radio and  
11 T.V. this year? Twenty-one thousand dollars in radio and  
12 four hundred and eight thousand dollars on T.V.

13 MR. ESTEY: And the newspaper?

14 MR. CAMPBELL: The newspaper for 1966,  
15 forty-four thousand dollars. That is for newspapers and  
16 trade papers.

17 MR. ESTEY: Posters?

18 MR. SAMPSON: We don't have it broken down  
19 separately as such. We have that in printing and publish-  
20 ing.

21 MR. ESTEY: Printing and publishing come  
22 under the same advertising budget?

23 MR. CAMPBELL: Part of it.

24 MR. ESTEY: Would part of it be in the office?

25 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

26 MR. ESTEY: Other than newspaper, radio and  
27 T.V., do you have anything in the six hundred and twenty-  
28 five thousand odd item that one would class under the  
29 heading of advertising?

30 MR. CAMPBELL: Under that six hundred and





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

Page 2

1 twenty-five thousand dollars, sir, we have T.V. which is  
2 advertising.

3 MR. ESTEY: To shorten it up, you have four  
4 hundred and seventy-five thousand in radio, T.V. and  
5 newspapers. The other one hundred and fifty thousand dol-  
6 lars is made up with public relations work?

7 MR. CAMPBELL: Also, sir, we have outdoor  
8 billings. That could be called advertising. This is  
9 fifty-seven thousand dollars.

10 MR. ESTEY: That is what I was asking about,  
11 the posters. That is what you call the outdoor billings?  
12 Those are pictures?

13 MR. CAMPBELL: No, we are talking twenty-  
14 four sheet panels.

15 MR. ESTEY: You mean the E.L. Ruddy signs?

16 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

17 MR. ESTEY: Fifty-seven thousand dollars  
18 for that?

19 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. That then gentlemen is  
20 the item you might call strictly advertising.

21 MR. ESTEY: Let us concentrate on T.V.,  
22 four hundred and eight thousand dollars. I take it you  
23 funnel that mainly through the T.V. stations of southern  
24 Ontario?

25 MR. CAMPBELL: All Ontario. We use every  
26 T.V. station in the province.

27 MR. ESTEY: You wouldn't spend as much in  
28 Port Arthur as on C.F.T.O.?

29 MR. CAMPBELL: No, sir.

30 MR. ESTEY: Mostly in southern Ontario





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2813

1 stations?

2 MR. CAMPBELL: Largely.

3 MR. ESTEY: And you use all the T.V. stat-  
4 ions in the province?

5 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.

6 MR. ESTEY: And you have to pay for that  
7 time, I take it?

8 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.

9 MR. ESTEY: Is some of it given to you free?

10 MR. CAMPBELL: We get approximately dollar  
11 for dollar.

12 MR. ESTEY: How do you spend it? Do you  
13 have an advertising agency?

14 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir. We produce T.V.  
15 commercials within the industry for the purposes we  
16 jointly feel are what we should be using, and we buy time  
17 on the station and try to get prime time.

18 MR. ESTEY: Are those commercials mainly  
19 one minute or thirty seconds?

20 MR. CAMPBELL: We have sixty seconds and  
21 twenty seconds.

22 MR. ESTEY: Do you have access to this kind  
23 of information from the United States Safety Associations,  
24 or Quebec, or other provinces?

25 MR. CAMPBELL: No, sir. We are the only  
26 people who ever really went into the field. We get free  
27 time from the border United States stations' T.V. chan-  
28 nels, because we supply them with our commercials. They  
29 use them but don't charge for them.

30 MR. ESTEY: Why would they run those for





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2844

1 you for nothing?

2 MR. CAMPBELL: Because they can't get any-  
3 thing like it in the United States. Nobody produces this  
4 kind of message.

5 MR. ESTEY: Do they have them made by the  
6 Construction Safety Association of Ontario?

7 MR. CAMPBELL: No, sir, the Construction  
8 Safety Association produces them.

9 MR. ESTEY: You produce your own strips,  
10 that is what you are saying?

11 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

12 MR. ESTEY: You engage the talent, the  
13 facilities and produce the strip announcements and deliver  
14 those to the stations?

15 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

16 MR. ESTEY: Do you have any measurement of  
17 success or lack of success in those programmes?

18 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, we have.

19 MR. ESTEY: You do a survey?

20 MR. CAMPBELL: That is right, and they tell  
21 us we have a ninety percent awareness throughout the  
22 province of the construction safety problem from our T.V.  
23 advertising. Ninety percent of the people in the province  
24 are aware of it. Then we have further refinements, break-  
25 downs of what they might remember, specifically they might  
26 mention hard hats, safety boots, or a man on a steel beam.  
27 We have a breakdown of what they remember.

28 MR. ESTEY: Who made that survey?

29 MR. CAMPBELL: Canadian Facts.

30 MR. ESTEY: How long ago?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2845

1                   MR. CAMPBELL: We had one prepared this  
2 year and one a year ago.

3                   MR. ESTEY: Would you have a copy of a  
4 survey for this year available?

5                   MR. CAMPBELL: No, sir, I don't have one  
6 available with me.

7                   MR. ESTEY: That is all right. I am re-  
8 minded, would you be good enough to send us one of the  
9 safety manuals just coming off the press? Would you do  
10 that?

11                  MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir. As a matter of  
12 fact we have that down on the pad to make sure you did  
13 receive it.

14                  MR. ESTEY: Let us go back to T.V. You did  
15 a survey three years ago and since then your budget for  
16 T.V., has it increased or decreased?

17                  MR. CAMPBELL: We started off in 1963 with  
18 a forty thousand budget for television and radio, in  
19 1963. In 1964 we moved that up to two hundred and fifty  
20 thousand dollars.

21                  MR. ESTEY: You hired an agency this time  
22 and went after it in a big way?

23                  MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir. In 1965, as I  
24 recall it, our T.V. and radio budget was approximately  
25 the same, somewhere in the area of four hundred and twenty-  
26 five thousand to four hundred and fifty thousand dollars.  
27 In 1966 it is four hundred and eight thousand dollars  
28 and our proposal for 1967 is three hundred and fifteen  
29 thousand dollars. Our cut back is not because we feel  
30 T.V. is not doing a job, but for other reasons.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2846

1                   MR. ESTEY: What would the reasons be?  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

                  MR. CAMPBELL: We feel in the last three years the construction industry has appropriated or spent considerable sums of money in creating an awareness of the safety problem, which has been a benefit to other groups other than construction. The contractors feel that they have created an awareness and that we would like to try and concentrate next year on more of a motivating operation.

                  MR. ESTEY: I suppose it is fair to say one of the weaknesses of the use of T.V. is you share it over the general public, where you are aiming it at part of it?

                  MR. CAMPBELL: From the construction point of view there is a tremendous amount of waste circulation, but it isn't waste from a six and one-half million population point of view.

                  MR. ESTEY: You are also benefiting the I.A.P.A., members and so on?

                  MR. CAMPBELL: And the whole spectrum of the safety problem.

                  MR. ESTEY: How much co-ordination is there of the safety associations for their television advertising programming, do you share the costs?

                  MR. CAMPBELL: No.

                  MR. ESTEY: Do you have any institutional ads all beamed at construction workers?

                  MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir. We have been selfish in that respect but we have developed our material to try and attack our particular problem with two hundred





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2847

1 odd thousand workers in our industry.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: What was your esimated  
3 1967 figure?

4 MR. CAMPBELL: For T.V., three hundred and  
5 fifteen thousand dollars.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Three hundred and fif-  
7 teen thousand?

8 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.

9 MR. ESTEY: I should have asked you, this  
10 is mainly evening television announcements you are buying?

11 MR. CAMPBELL: Largely.

12 MR. ESTEY: You have no programmes?

13 MR. CAMPBELL: No, sir.

14 MR. ESTEY: The C.B.C. doesn't conduct any  
15 safety programmes that you might bring about by persuasion  
16 or otherwise?

17 MR. CAMPBELL: No, sir. We have worked on  
18 these people a number of times trying to get a piece of  
19 the total Canadian dollar for our province and industry,  
20 but we have not been successful.

21 MR. ESTEY: Moving over to something else,  
22 we have heard a great deal of discussion, I don't say it  
23 one way or the other, but it is a fact we have heard a  
24 great deal of discussion about the problems of labour  
25 union members working in casing work, but under pressure.  
26 You mentioned that in a general way a few minutes ago  
27 about the kind of contractor who needs some special train-  
28 ing, and I take it you have safety construction courses  
29 for supervisory personnel in that field?

30 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2848

1                   MR. ESTEY: Is it administered in the same  
2 way as your general safety programme with some 'on the  
3 job lectures' and demonstrations?

4                   MR. SAMPSON: No. We have not had any 'on  
5 the job' work in that area and it may be the smallest  
6 piece of our total effort, but we are equipped and able  
7 to and have done some of this kind of work, and over the  
8 period of years we have had people on our staff who have  
9 had experience in casing type of work.

10                  MR. ESTEY: I take it some of these people  
11 who had that experience were those who gave the courses  
12 to supervisory personnel?

13                  MR. SAMPSON: No. Mostly safety counsell-  
14 ors visiting job sites.

15                  MR. ESTEY: What do you do now in the field  
16 of casing contracts?

17                  MR. SAMPSON: The only thing we will do is  
18 if we can work directly with the members of Class 23, the  
19 sewers, and we mean contractors, we will work with their  
20 supervisory staff and any workmen we can corral into  
21 courses.

22                  MR. ESTEY: I see. Perhaps if I might go  
23 back, perhaps you have something to say on the whole  
24 business of posters. You turned them out on a multi-  
25 lingual basis. You don't confine them to the English  
26 language. How do you distribute them and effectively get  
27 them put up?

28                  MR. SAMPSON: I would just like to make sure  
29 what we mean when we say "posters" and turn them out multi-  
30 lingually. I would like to be known we have quite a number





Keilercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2849

1 of posters. We cut back considerably on the quantity of  
2 subjects and we don't have all our posters multi-lingual.  
3 We have some. Our distribution is a problem but it al-  
4 ways has been a problem, and I assume distribution of  
5 this kind of material will remain a problem to anybody  
6 to try and distribute it. Nobody likes to put up posters.  
7 Our distribution is largely done today through contract-  
8 or whatever is the number required of our posters. Some  
9 of our contractors have safety directors and they visit  
10 our office rather frequently to pick up bundles of the  
11 material we have. We let them go around and they select  
12 whatever they wish, and they are the people to see the  
13 posters go up on their projects, but our distribution is  
14 far from perfect.

16 MR. ESTEY: This is because of the very  
17 nature of construction, isn't it?

18 MR. CAMPBELL: And the very nature of a  
19 staff of forty-five people.

20 MR. ESTEY: And the contractor and group  
21 employees are nomadic?

22 MR. SAMPSON: Oh, yes we are.

23 MR. ESTEY: The places to get posters put  
24 up on some construction sites would not be easy to find?

25 MR. SAMPSON: Places to put up posters are  
26 It is a question of physical manpower of getting posters  
27 put up. For example Coca Cola, and this company spent  
28 lots of money for posters, are always worried about how  
29 many are burned and how many are put up.

30 MR. ESTEY: I take it you find posters are





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2850

1 a worthwhile part of your programme?

2 MR. SAMPSON: Very definitely an important  
3 auxilliary part of the whole programme.

4 MR. ESTEY: They are aimed at the man actually  
5 working, not aimed at somebody in control?

6 MR. SAMPSON: They are aimed at the man who  
7 gets hurt. This is one of our prime purposes in life. You  
8 have over two hundred thousand construction workers and on  
9 an average ten percent of them are injured. This is our  
10 target, to try and get these men conscious and aware of  
11 the right of survival. This is why we have spent so much  
12 money in television. We felt we had to get to these people  
13 and you can't get to them by knocking on doors. We have  
14 had to spend a lot of money on waste circulation, if you  
15 will, to try and get to these people.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: I am going to adjourn,  
17 Mr. Estey for ten minutes.

18  
19 \*\*\*  
20  
21 --- The Commission adjourned  
22 for ten minutes.  
23 \*\*\*  
24  
25  
26

27 MR. ESTEY: Gentlemen, the remaining  
28 questions I have, I perhaps should emphasize I will put the  
29 question and you people decide who will answer. Before I  
30 leave it, on the question of posters I take it that you  
have a variety of targets of interest, as regards your





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2851

1 publicity programme. You either are going to the workman  
2 or aim it at the supervisor or management. In the case of  
3 posters you aim at the workman you told me?

4 MR. SAMPSON: That is true.

5 MR. ESTEY: Obviously everybody has a problem  
6 of seeing the posters are put up and in the best place.  
7 Having in mind the success you had in your co-operative  
8 movement with trade unions in your Ottawa and Toronto cru-  
9 sade, do you distribute the posters?

10 MR. SAMPSON: The gentlemen in Ottawa were  
11 very helpful -- the business agents of the locals down  
12 there -- in accomplishing this, and in Toronto as I said  
13 earlier some eighty or ninety business agents in the city  
14 volunteered for this job, because we have not the manpower  
15 to get around to all these jobs, and the business agents  
16 are constantly moving around construction sites and they  
17 felt they were in a good position to help us in this respect,  
18 and they did an excellent job for us.

19 MR. ESTEY: So I take it there is, in your  
20 view of things, a roll to be played in the future in this  
21 kind of a programme including the distribution of posters?

22 MR. SAMPSON: Well, sir, we have to have the  
23 support and co-operation of everybody. Now the workmen  
24 and the unions are playing a very important part. We have  
25 got to have the help and support of organized labour and  
26 unorganized labour to make a whole apple. This is a neces-  
27 sity.

28 MR. ESTEY: Now carrying along this thought  
29 of the programme and the audience you aim it at, so far as  
30 the newspapers are concerned, your audience perhaps is





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2852

1 wider than your posters and you direct part of the newspaper  
2 campaign to managers and supervisors?

3 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir.

4 MR. ESTEY: And I take it some has to go to  
5 the general public because they attend at construction for  
6 delivery purposes and so on?

7 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir. A couple of years  
8 ago we ran a full page advertisement in every newspaper in  
9 the Province of Ontario, and aimed at contractors and con-  
10 struction workers in the trenching industry. We were  
11 getting too many fatalities in cave-ins and damaged people  
12 in the trenching industry. We ran a full page newspaper  
13 advertisement with a direct appeal to the contractors and  
14 construction workers, in which we urged them never to go  
15 into a hole or a trench if, in their opinion or their think-  
16 ing, it wasn't safe. Our prime interest is saving lives.  
17 I don't care how, just so long as we save them.

18 MR. ESTEY: To get on with this line of in-  
19 quiry, I have an example of what I want to ask you about.  
20 It is an ad in the Globe and Mail of November 1st. It has  
21 the name of your association in the bottom. This kind of  
22 thing talks about the experience of a contractor going  
23 one hundred and seven days without an accident and the sign  
24 he has on his project that hard hats and safety shoes must  
25 be worn. I take it this says, "do all you can for the  
26 workers on the sites." It is not so much aimed at the  
27 workmen, but the supervisor and management levels so their  
28 employment conforms with the programmes you are supporting?

29 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir. There are several  
30 facets to a testimonial type of advertisement. It is an





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

285.

1 effort to shame other contractors into doing a proper job.

2 MR. ESTEY: You give the contractor a fair  
3 amount of publicity?

4 MR. SAMPSON: That is right. We are showing  
5 what a contractor who will pay attention to safety and pay  
6 attention to the man he makes a dollar from, what he can  
7 do and what has been done to accomplish this. We are try-  
8 ing persuasion.

9 MR. ESTEY: Do you have a policy where you  
10 hold some of your contractors up to a reprimand inside the  
11 safety association, if they have a relatively bad safety  
12 record?

13 MR. SAMPSON: I have had, and several of my  
14 people have had, some heated and very stirring discussions  
15 with contractors.

16 MR. ESTEY: Does this give rise to staff  
17 troubles, bearing in mind the staff works for the directors  
18 and bearing in mind they are contractors?

19 MR. SAMPSON: None whatsoever.

20 MR. CAMPBELL: None whatsoever. If we can  
21 be fortunate enough to recognize an individual as a board  
22 member who isn't holding up his end of the business, and  
23 not doing a good job, the directors have gone on occasion  
24 to these people including our staff, to try and show the  
25 person the ills of his ways.

26 MR. ESTEY: This is a voluntary association  
27 where you please yourself by directing your safety campaign  
28 at yourselves and I am putting the question frankly, I hope,  
29 Mr. Campbell, does this self-inflicted instruction pro-  
30 gramme ever cause such dissention in the organization





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2854

1 amongst the sponsoring contractors that it gives rise to  
2 staff troubles?

3 MR. CAMPBELL: No, sir.

4 MR. ESTEY: Do you have a high turnover in  
5 management counsellors amongst the ten men?

6 MR. CAMPBELL: In the educational department  
7 and management counselling, we have had quite a high turn-  
8 over. There is no place we can go if we want an extra man  
9 to go to work for us. There are none available. As we  
10 train them, industry has hired them away from us.

11 MR. ESTEY: As safety directors and this  
12 kind of thing?

13 MR. SAMPSON: We know we will lose so many  
14 to industry and we are happy to say this is where they go  
15 at present, rather than lose them through personal conflict.

16 MR. ESTEY: Do you happen to know if your  
17 turnover is higher than the I.A.P.A., staff?

18 MR. SAMPSON: I don't know.

19 MR. CAMPBELL: How many people went to in-  
20 dustry from our place?

21 MR. SAMPSON: This year four people have gone  
22 to industry and I would like to recount a telephone con-  
23 versation of five o'clock last night. It has a great bear-  
24 ing. A contractor called me last night at five o'clock and  
25 said, "I have a new job and I am in bad need of a safety  
26 director." I said, "where is the job, what type of job and  
27 what is the duration?" To which he replied. I said, "they  
28 are not easy to find, there are not too many around. What  
29 kind of money are you going to pay this man?" And the  
30 answer was, "I will leave that in your hands." I said,





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2855

1 "on a previous job what did you pay that man?" He told me  
2 He said, "what do you think?" I said, "it depends on the  
3 quality of the man and what you would pay or suggest you  
4 pay. Number one, are you going to give this man authority  
5 on the job?" He said, "oh yes, yes." I said, "are you  
6 serious? Are you going to give him authority to look after  
7 the workmen on the job? If you are I might get you a good  
8 calibre type of man. If not I am not interested a bit. If  
9 you are just putting a body on the job who lives up to the  
10 act and not give him authority, you might as well have no-  
11 body on the job." This is the gist of the conversation  
12 last night. This contractor is serious and he is a good  
13 fellow. I am hard put to find a man for him. I may talk  
14 to some of my own people and maybe one might be interested  
15 in jumping on this job. If he is I will have a turnover.

16 MR. ESTEY: Does the safety association enter  
17 actively in locating safety engineers for contractors?

18 MR. SAMPSON: It is a regular occurrence but  
19 not voluminous.

20 MR. ESTEY: Who hires your staff under the  
21 direction of the board of directors?

22 MR. SAMPSON: No, the staff is hired by the  
23 paid employees. Myself.

24 MR. ESTEY: You hire your own staff?

25 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir.

26 MR. ESTEY: In the chain of command you are  
27 responsible to the board of directors of the safety associa-  
28 tion?

29 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir, I am responsible  
30 immediately to my president and the executive council.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2856

1                   MR. ESTEY: What is the chain of responsibility,  
2                   if any, back to Mr. Draper, for your organization?

3                   MR. SAMPSON: No responsibility. Mr. Draper  
4                   and myself and people in our organization are in contact  
5                   on a frequent basis.

6                   MR. ESTEY: Your line of supervision is back  
7                   to your executives of the association?

8                   MR. SAMPSON: That is right. Mr. Draper's  
9                   line of responsibility, as I know it at this point, is  
10                  direct liaison with myself in my position.

11                  MR. ESTEY: One of the reasons I raise the  
12                  question is that it may be that in some circles, and it is  
13                  up to us to find out, as to whether there is a conflict  
14                  of interest of having a safety association run by the  
15                  people who are encouraged to promote the safety programme.  
16                  You have a parallel not unlike the commissioner of base-  
17                  ball not being able to discipline the owners who hire him.  
18                  I want to make sure you understand it. This is not par-  
19                  allel in your view?

20                  MR. SAMPSON: No, sir. On occasions I have  
21                  gone out on a limb and feared this is it and I better find  
22                  myself another job, but that has never happened but the  
23                  opportunities have been there. Nobody has ever brought  
24                  any pressure personally upon me to say Sampson, you will  
25                  lose your job. On the contrary we have had heated words  
26                  but we have acted like gentlemen and business men and come  
27                  to some kind of a conclusion.

28                  MR. ESTEY: The suggestion has been made to  
29                  me to follow a line of inquiry more broadly than I did. I  
30                  want to know whether or not there is a rising frequency





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2857

1 of "on the job" instruction of safety in the construction  
2 industry now by your association, or whether you still  
3 predominately promote your programme through instruction  
4 off the job through Toronto facilities and elsewhere?

5 MR. SAMPSON: Largely our educational efforts  
6 are off the job.

7 MR. ESTEY: This applies as well to the  
8 tunnelling operations, the casing work, as it does to gen-  
9 eral contracting, mechanical subcontracting, and that is  
10 generally the case?

11 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir. We would like to be-  
12 come less of a night-time institution and more of a daytime  
13 institution, but this is a transitional period. You have  
14 a group of contractors who have workmen working for them  
15 who have homes in the rest of the province. We deal with  
16 the human element. We move in and say we would like three  
17 hours of the men's time on your time. Now remember this is  
18 a dollar factor. Supposing there are twenty to forty to  
19 one hundred men. There you have a dollar factor. Three  
20 years ago when we started talking this way we feared we  
21 would never get over the hump, but I can report today we  
22 are getting more and more contractors saying, "okay, we  
23 will close the job down at noon or close the job at four  
24 and keep the men to five, and they don't lose an hour of  
25 their time." Progress is being made in this area.

26 MR. ESTEY: Whether or not it is adviseable  
27 depends on the nature of the site? In some cases you  
28 couldn't have "on the job" instruction, you would have to  
29 go elsewhere?

30 MR. SAMPSON: That is right.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2858

1 MR. ESTEY: Take this project in Toronto,  
2 the T.T.C. subway open cut construction, tunnelling and  
3 above the ground and all manner of things, casings being  
4 built, foundations, casings, piles and stations above the  
5 ground, what do you do there? Obviously you have posters  
6 because I have seen them on the sites. Do you have "on  
7 the job" safety meetings?

8 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, we have, and we promote  
9 after hours, with the contractor, to have tool box talks  
10 both in English and in foreign languages, but with all the  
11 contractors without exception on the subway, we have worked  
12 directly with their men and they have sent their men down  
13 to our place for educational instruction. Quite a number  
14 of contractors have been involved on the subway and I guess--

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Two of those fourteen  
16 teach in Italian you said?

17 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir.

18 MR. ESTEY: Do you have courses for their  
19 safety directors?

20 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir.

21 MR. ESTEY: I take it in major contracts like  
22 that they invariably have their own safety directors?

23 MR. SAMPSON: It is a condition of the sub-  
24 way. A condition of the T.T.C. that each contractor is to  
25 have a safety man or safety director on the subway.

26 MR. ESTEY: And you work through him?

27 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, we do work through him  
28 and work directly with the top management. But the safety  
29 director on the subway, for example, is a man who should  
30 have -- and I say should have -- because there are all





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2859

1 kinds of rumours I have heard they haven't got it, but  
2 should have complete authority on the subway to see the  
3 jobs are provided with safe working conditions for the men  
4 and all the necessary things desirable.

5 MR. ESTEY: One of the problems on engineer-  
6 ing works of that kind is an opinion of what is the safe  
7 procedure?

8 MR. SAMPSON: This is one of the games of  
9 life.

10 MR. ESTEY: You would have a lot of engineer-  
11 ing competition on which is the better way?

12 THE COMMISSIONER: The other thing is, I  
13 suppose, there are a number of different construction com-  
14 panies operating?

15 MR. SAMPSON: On the subway, sir, yes. I  
16 would guess seven or eight.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: You say a safety director.  
18 Do you suggest one safety director in all the companies  
19 working?

20 MR. SAMPSON: Do you mean an overall official  
21 safety director?

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I suppose when you have a  
23 contractor and subcontractor, he has a safety man and would  
24 control the subcontractor?

25 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir.

26 MR. CAMPBELL: I believe the T.T.C. has a  
27 safety supervisor and each contractor is supposed to have  
28 a safety director.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Their safety director has  
30 some control over the subcontractors, has he?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2860

1                   MR. CAMPBELL: This is the theory I have  
2 heard. Mr. Gallagher in the back of the room might know.

3                   MR. GALLAGHER: What was the question?

4                   MR. ESTEY: The question is whether or not  
5 there is an overall safety director of the T.T.C. in charge  
6 of the whole subway programme, or a safety director for  
7 each of the seven or eight contractors.

8                   MR. GALLAGHER: As far as I know, there is  
9 no overall safety inspector at all, and as far as the  
10 safety inspectors of the company is concerned they are  
11 completely under the domination of the contractors and  
12 completely inadequate; and I feel very strongly that the  
13 presentation this morning is not very accurate. You will  
14 excuse me.

15                  MR. ESTEY: Well, Mr. Gallagher, thank you  
16 very much. One thing I wanted to ask you about is the  
17 safety director question of the subway. I raise it because  
18 it is an engineering work with a variety of things. The  
19 work is largely done by subcontractors but it looks like  
20 a general contractor, but in fact a subcontractor, is that  
21 true?

22                  MR. SAMPSON: I think, generally.

23                  MR. ESTEY: Is that why the subcontractor  
24 has a safety director to make the subcontractors conform?

25                  MR. SAMPSON: The situation as I know it is  
26 the general contractor has to have a safety man on the job.  
27 Now the general contractor is responsible for the behavior  
28 of the subcontractor safety wise, who come in on his job.  
29 Therefore the safety man for the general contractor has  
30 jurisdiction, or should have jurisdiction, over the sub-





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2861

1 contractors and how they work safety on that particular  
2 job, because in the final analysis the general contractor  
3 is the man that can be held responsible.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: When you say the "general  
5 contractor" has to have a safety man, are there some regu-  
6 lations that require it?

7 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, the T.T.C. have this  
8 written into the contract.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: It isn't required under  
10 any construction safety act or anything?

11 MR. SAMPSON: No, sir. Not to my knowledge.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: You are talking about a  
13 particular job and that is the T.T.C. job?

14 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: I see, thank you.

16 MR. ESTEY: These discussions seem difficult  
17 to follow. Let us take the T.T.C. job. What do you do  
18 and what is, you hope, an effective safety programme? How  
19 do you reach the subcontractors?

20 MR. SAMPSON: Our management counsellors for  
21 example. They are allotted "X" number of contractors and  
22 they work directly with the contractors and try to encour-  
23 age and scare up the workmen from those contractors to  
24 attend safety educational courses, either at our offices  
25 here or in motels throughout the city or on the subway.

26 MR. ESTEY: So you would have the same con-  
27 dition operating with the casing drilling group in the sub-  
28 way, as you would have with the steel riggers on the big  
29 bank building?

30 MR. SAMPSON: That is right. The principle





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2862

1 is the same.

2 MR. ESTEY: And whatever kind of  
3 contractor makes no difference to you?

4 MR. SAMPSON: No, the principle is an over-  
5 all principle, that is at this point.

6 MR. ESTEY: Either of you may wish to answer  
7 this. Your association has a representative on the Ontario  
8 Labour Safety Council?

9 MR. SAMPSON: Yes, sir

10 MR. ESTEY: Is that your president, Mr.  
11 Campbell?

12 MR. SAMPSON: The past president.

13 MR. ESTEY: And he serves on the council for  
14 one year?

15 MR. SAMPSON: It is two years I understand  
16 now.

17 MR. ESTEY: Well then, does your association  
18 take an active part in the operations of this labour safety  
19 council?

20 MR. SAMPSON: I won't say an active part.  
21 Our past president is one of the members of the labour  
22 safety council. We don't become actively engaged in the  
23 labour safety council. We attended a conference a month  
24 ago at the lecture. There was another one in Kingston at  
25 the end of November. We work in conjunction with the  
26 Workmen's Compensation Board with Mr. Draper in this con-  
27 nection, but apart from that we have no active participation.

28 MR. ESTEY: You say in a letter of August  
29 3rd, "the recent creation of the Ontario Labour Safety  
30 Council, chosen as an advisory council to the Minister of





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

1863

1 Labour, is commencing to function in a positive way." Can  
2 you explain that?

3 MR. SAMPSON: Well, for example at the Lake-  
4 head at the Minister's conference, there were some two  
5 hundred people drawn together there, and I had a distinct  
6 feeling that for the first time there were two hundred  
7 people involved in this whole sphere, who first got to  
8 know each other better and became acquainted with the broad  
9 aspects of the whole problem. In the workshop period of  
10 that conference the preponderance of emphasis was placed  
11 upon the need for education in the whole safety field.  
12 There was an awful lot of work and effort done at this  
13 conference and I am sure the one in Kingston will even be  
14 better, because we will have ironed out some of the bugs  
15 in the first one. There is a group of people now more  
16 likely to become united down the road towards a concerted  
17 effort on the whole safety problem. I think the Minister's  
18 Safety Conference and the Ontario Labour Safety Council  
19 who to my knowledge have a group of very able people on it,  
20 cannot help but become a very effective advisory group to  
21 the Minister.

22 MR. ESTEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Sampson.

23 Mr. Commissioner, we have Mr. Legge, the  
24 chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board with us, along  
25 with some of his staff, for the purpose of discussing gen-  
26 erally some of the larger topics which have arisen in the  
27 course of our hearing, and while it is twenty after twelve  
28 I think we can helpfully get on with this at this time.

29 Mr. Legge, have you a formal brief to pre-  
30 sent? I don't suppose the lecturn has any value if you





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2864

1 wish to sit down, and if you want your staff to sit with  
2 you it might be more convenient.

3 Mr. Legge, we have been dealing as you know  
4 with forty odd briefs, and heard fifty or sixty people on  
5 many facets of the statute you administer through your  
6 Board, and we have had also I might point out in passing,  
7 the help of the Deputy Minister of one department of the  
8 government, and a Chief of the Department of Mines, and  
9 perhaps other representatives of government. We have also  
10 had the assistance of a long number of presentations from  
11 your treasurer Mr. Kerr, who is active in this matter, and  
12 the director of medical services. So this morning, unless  
13 you wish to get into it, we are not so concerned with the  
14 matters of bits and pieces but rather the general issues.

15 Now, out of these discussions have come a  
16 number of things which give rise to some questions in our  
17 mind to see how the machine works. One is this. You have  
18 a three-man board administering the functions of the Work-  
19 men's Compensation Act. You are the chairman and we have  
20 heard you have a vice-chairman and a board member. Can  
21 you enlighten us how in fact you operate? Do you, as the  
22 chairman, allocate areas of operations to the other two  
23 members and do you yourself concentrate on some part of the  
24 administration?

25 MR. BRUCE LEGGE: The Workmen's Compensation  
26 Board is a corporate body under the Act, and therefore it  
27 is not divided into three parts, but in a sense is a cor-  
28 porate presidency. When the Board was small it was pos-  
29 sible to allocate areas of responsibility, as you have  
30 suggested, as for example the medical commissioner could





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2865

1 exercise surveillance over the medical operation. The  
2 vice-chairman could exercise over-lordship of the claims  
3 department. The chairman could deal with the safety  
4 associations and in that specialized way it could be done.

5 Now that the Board is so large and the case  
6 load is so heavy, it must have expert management and ob-  
7 viously, if it were divided up by channels of communication  
8 to various members of the Board, rather than the Board  
9 acting as a corporate presidency, I would specialize in  
10 business management, the legal side of it, and Dr. Steele  
11 would do the medicine and the vice-chairman would do the  
12 claims. This would leave an important area with no one  
13 looking after it, or several areas with no one specific-  
14 ally concerned with it. So we have laid out a principle  
15 officer system, or corporate vice-presidency, where the  
16 principle officers are responsible for the main line ac-  
17 tivities, the chief medical officer for medicine, the  
18 general council for decision making. The claims department  
19 has Mr. Kerr as their principle officer and that sort of  
20 thing, and they report to the Board in a formal way.

21 The Board gives direction to the principle  
22 officers but the Board does not interfere in the day to  
23 day operations of the principle officer's duty.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: You speak of the volume  
25 of work. How many claims a year do you get or handle?

26 MR. LEGGE: Well, my Lord, the prognostication  
27 for 1966 will be of the order of four hundred thousand  
28 claims, and it might be helpful to you that in 1956 it was  
29 the order of two hundred and fifty thousand claims.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: What was the actual number?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

1 in 1965?

2 MR. LEGGE: In 1965 the precise number was  
3 of the order of three hundred and fifty-nine thousand.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: I saw a statement of yours  
5 some place or another about how many compensation cheques  
6 a day went out of our office. What was that figure?

7 MR. LEGGE: Mr. MacDonald would have to give  
8 you that figure my Lord. I can tell you in a busy day  
9 eighteen hundred new claims can come in.

10 MR. ESTEY: I think we heard it was a poor  
11 day if you didn't get fifteen hundred?

12 MR. LEGGE: I think that is right.

13 MR. ESTEY: In this tremendous volume of  
14 work going through the Board, I take it, from listening  
15 to the description from your staff members, that you could  
16 with some realism divide your functions into three parts.  
17 The executive works and runs it as a business with a board  
18 of directors. Do you have regulatory or legislative func-  
19 tions you have to perform, possibly legislation under the  
20 Act, to discharge some of your responsibilities? We heard  
21 some considerable discussion of your quasi-judicial function  
22 -- perhaps -- constitutionally. You have already described  
23 your executive function as being in charge of housekeeping  
24 and overall operation of the Board's purposes. On your  
25 legislative or rule making side, I take it -- and we have  
26 seen these are all subject to the approval of the Lieut-  
27 enant-Governor in Council -- this is a function you dis-  
28 charge on occasion but is now largely confined to amend-  
29 ment and up-dating your regulations?

30 MR. LEGGE: That is correct.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2867

1                   MR. ESTEY: Such as first aid -- we heard a  
2 lot of discussion on the first aid regulation change not  
3 long ago to adjust to the new condition -- did you hold  
4 any hearings or anything of that kind in reaching a de-  
5 cision on your regulations?

6                   MR. LEGGE: We have not since my advent,  
7 but it would not be precluded. We have hearings for al-  
8 most every conceivable subject. We have directors of  
9 safety associations, applications from labour unions and  
10 we find it a very effective way of getting the other  
11 person's point of view. We could have, but we haven't  
12 had any in my time.

13                  MR. ESTEY: The occasion has not arisen with  
14 contentious legislation as yet?

15                  MR. LEGGE: Not yet.

16                  MR. ESTEY: On the appeal side the details  
17 have been described to us. I notice in one Royal Com-  
18 mission out west, the comment was made they did not think  
19 they needed the four layer construction we have in Ontario,  
20 that is the Appeal Tribunal in the field. I take it from  
21 your viewpoint, with a great mass of claims that come in,  
22 the function of the Board and the functions of the three  
23 men on the Board would be seriously impeded if you had to  
24 devote a substantial part of your time handling appeals?

25                  MR. LEGGE: I agree with that assumption.  
26 I agree with the finding of Mr. Justice Bird it is not  
27 needed in British Columbia, which does only twenty percent  
28 of this Board as to actual adjudication of appeal.

29                  I think it is very important that the Board  
30 exercises its responsibility with knowledge. I don't





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

1968

1 think you can sit as an administrative tribunal, which is  
2 the ultimate appeal in claims, if you do not know how  
3 people are treated and how everything is done in the Board.  
4 If otherwise, it would be better done in court. As an  
5 administrative tribunal you must know and have notice of  
6 what goes on in the compensation world. We do have that  
7 and I think it is important that the chief judicial people  
8 the people with the burden of responsibility of the Board,  
9 as a hospital rehabilitation agency and as a fund paying  
10 organization do have this.

11 MR. ESTEY: As far as the Board appeals are  
12 concerned, that is those heard by the Board, we heard you  
13 have a quorum of two, the secretary is there and acts as  
14 advisor to the Board and has a function to play in the  
15 hearing. What fraction of the claimants appealing to the  
16 Board itself would be represented by somebody?

17 MR. LEGGE: I would say approximately eighty  
18 percent, and in this order they would be represented most  
19 numerically by union leaders, secondly by lawyers and  
20 thirdly by parliamentarians and then there is a small group  
21 of relatives and clergymen, and only twenty percent who  
22 have no form of representation at the field tribunal and  
23 appear before the Board.

24 MR. ESTEY: In the course of this hearing  
25 the representative has the right to speak and discuss the  
26 matter?

27 MR. LEGGE: Oh, absolutely.

28 MR. ESTEY: And if the matter is heard, do  
29 you always hand down written decisions or reasons, or how  
30 is it handled?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2869

1                   MR. LEGGE: Again I can only speak for the  
2 last two years. Certainly we now follow all the require-  
3 ments to cut administration and procedure as outlined in  
4 the Gordon Commission, the Franks Commission in England  
5 and what Judge Landis said in the United States. Cases  
6 are decided on the evidence and reasons given. Every time  
7 there is a rejection of the case the applicant or injured  
8 workman is told of his right to appeal. He has instant  
9 notice.

10                  THE COMMISSIONER: What percentage in the  
11 end -- what percentage of cases are rejected?

12                  MR. LEGGE: On the basis of last year, my  
13 Lord, and last year there would be three hundred and sixty  
14 thousand cases if my recollection serves me, in the order  
15 of fourteen thousand out of the three hundred and sixty  
16 thousand. It is a very minute proportion.

17                  THE COMMISSIONER: What percentage does that  
18 amount to?

19                  MR. LEGGE: In the order of four percent.

20                  MR. ESTEY: That would include as a claim,  
21 medical claims only, as well as lost time claims?

22                  MR. LEGGE: Yes. We take the view, of course,  
23 that a claim isn't a statistic. A medical claim is really  
24 just as important in that deciding qualities be required  
25 as any other claim. So we try to teach the doctrine,  
26 "behind every claim there is a man in this file, and it  
27 has to be not a statistic but a real problem in which people  
28 are concerned." If you don't get this in the staff of the  
29 Board you would have a computer type of human being who  
30 were working with statistics. The people on our staff





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

107

1 are made to feel this.

2 MR. ESTEY: I take it the medical aid claims  
3 only would not have the frequency of appeal that the lost  
4 time claims have?

5 MR. LEGGE: No. There is a special section  
6 as you heard for dealing with that type of claim.

7 MR. ESTEY: Turning, if I may for a moment,  
8 to your facilities. We heard a discussion by Mr. Mac-  
9 Donald and others of your branch offices, and sub branch  
10 offices, from what has gone on so far in this age of high  
11 speed communications, it is still practical to centralize  
12 the decision making in the headquarters in Toronto?

13 MR. LEGGE: Not only practical, but almost  
14 imperative. If you are going to have equality in every  
15 case on the order of three or four hundred thousand cases  
16 you must have uniformity of decision making. If you do  
17 decision making on a decentralized geographic basis it  
18 would be very hard to have uniformity, fairness and equal  
19 expertness in all the districts. I know no large decision  
20 maker, particularly the pension commission, the veterans'  
21 affairs and the insurance companies, I know of no large  
22 decision makers of this order who decentralize the decision  
23 making. There are, of course, many advantages of a public  
24 relations and information giving nature to be obtained  
25 from district offices, if wisely sited and properly staffed.  
26 Then there is the rehabilitation function, of course. A  
27 rehabilitation officer working in a district can be known  
28 to the employers in the district and the union leaders in  
29 the district and, therefore, can in a sense serve a person  
30 who needs a job better than as a stranger in the district.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

1871

1 There is a useful rehabilitation function in the districts.

2 MR. ESTEY: I take it that a prime reason  
3 for having a district office would be rehabilitation and  
4 dissemination of information?

5 MR. LEGGE: Yes, it is of no importance  
6 in decision making. It is good for information getting  
7 and giving organization.

8 MR. ESTEY: On the question of facilities,  
9 we have heard the comment that you have the one large  
10 rehabilitation centre, or hospital, in Toronto; and that  
11 is a facility for men only, I think somebody said. I take  
12 it the explanation for that is the incidence of required  
13 physical rehabilitation is much higher and is mostly male  
14 not female and you don't have the demand as yet?

15 MR. LEGGE: That is obviously part of the  
16 answer to the facility being primarily men. Only the  
17 Board doesn't rely on the hospital and rehabilitation  
18 centre as the only organization of good treatment and  
19 rehabilitation. We pay for services wherever available,  
20 in the major cities and this sort of thing. It isn't al-  
21 ways feasible to -- there are only four thousand cases a  
22 year at the hospital. These are the most difficult ones,  
23 the people who have been through the teaching hospitals  
24 and other rehabilitation agencies and that sort of thing,  
25 and now demand or require, if they are to be rehabilitated,  
26 a very specialized service. As for women, this could be  
27 provided at the Toronto Rehabilitation Centre here, for  
28 example, or some place in Ottawa or Hamilton and if the  
29 service is required we would pay for it. We would provide  
30 an equal rehabilitation service although it is not pro-





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2872

1 vided at Downsview.

2 MR. ESTEY: It is true, of a great number of  
3 functions including the contract for services, is established  
4 in your office?

5 MR. LEGGE: The doctrine of choice and re-  
6 ferral in the local area follows that line completely,  
7 yes.

8 MR. ESTEY: If I might change the subject,  
9 Mr. Legge, I will get to accident prevention. We have  
10 heard of the associations and how they operate. I was  
11 wondering if you have some light you might throw on the  
12 value of these associations in recent years, particularly  
13 since you became chairman two years ago?

14 MR. LEGGE: Yes, I agree the teaching advice  
15 of accident prevention is a voluntary process, and as  
16 people know more and more about the psychology, background  
17 and technical improvement imposed on plant and site to  
18 avoid accidents, that naturally the teaching advice has  
19 to improve and change. Thus for this reason we have a  
20 distinguished engineer as a director of safety. It has  
21 to be a concerted action by many people. I don't think  
22 the Board has the responsibility for safety associations,  
23 or that the Board is satisfied traditionally, or in the  
24 future this is all that needs to be done. I am not auth-  
25 orized to speak for the Minister, but it is common know-  
26 ledge he thinks the teaching, the enforcement and co-  
27 ordinating activities are all part of a parcel, and we  
28 should all go carefully together. Mr. Draper gives ideas  
29 to the associations. He receives ideas from them. He  
30 tries to co-ordinate their activities and make it economic-





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2877

1 ally sensible. He deals with the Department of Labour and  
2 the Board deals with unions and management.

3 MR. ESTEY: As to safety associations them-  
4 selves, I think their most useful aspect is teaching.

5 MR. LEGGE: You have people presumably in-  
6 terested or voluntary directors of something that takes  
7 their time and money. I suggest the analogy is like a  
8 club or church. The people who hold office are most in-  
9 terested and we think the voluntary enthusiasm is of  
10 tremendous help to the Board in getting the maximum effect-  
11 ive work.

12 MR. ESTEY: This relationship between the  
13 Board and the safety association is one that attracts  
14 interest. We know the Board has the official say in the  
15 budget, but how much defacto control does the Board enjoy  
16 over the budget of one of its component associations?  
17 Have you thought it too low? Have you raised/or if it is  
18 spent in a way you do not approve of, do you alter it?

19 MR. LEGGE: 1966 is the year of the first  
20 controlled budget. 1967, I think, would see in fact some  
21 real direction, some altering and changing in the light of  
22 experience of other associations. There may be some al-  
23 tering of objectives. There is no experience in changing  
24 them so far, in any way.

25 MR. ESTEY: When was the office Mr. Draper  
26 holds created?

27 MR. LEGGE: About a year ago.

28 MR. ESTEY: This, I take it, is part of the  
29 revitalization or reorientation of the safety associations  
30 vis-a-vis the Board?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2874

1 MR. LEGGE: He is the symbol of us. We  
2 want somebody who knows everybody and everything in the  
3 safety business to deal for us. We still deal with the  
4 president of the associations and he deals with the gener-  
5 al managers

6 THE COMMISSIONER: I want to make sure I  
7 understand you. Up until 1966 there was no direct control  
8 exercised by the Board over the budgets of the various  
9 safety associations?

10 MR. LEGGE: This is a very difficult ques-  
11 tion, my Lord. The word "direct" is the key one. There  
12 is no direct control. I am sure my predecessor talked to  
13 the associations about the problems, but as to having a  
14 director of projects which we now have in the Board for  
15 the department, who now deals with the associations, but  
16 for depending on the Board in that expert sense there was  
17 no direct control.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: That you will have in  
19 1966. Do you contemplate in 1967, by exercising some  
20 budgetary control it would influence the medical knowledge  
21 for which any one of those associations was spending this  
22 money?

23 MR. LEGGE: Yes, we are quite certain this  
24 is the most effective way.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: You feel you can exercise  
26 budgetary control?

27 MR. LEGGE: Yes we do and to carry it to a  
28 logical conclusion. If a safety association became re-  
29 calcitrant and said, "you are not helping us" they could  
30 withdraw from the patronage of the Board, keep their





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2875

1 association and collect their funds themselves. The  
2 safety association advantage in being under the control  
3 of the Board is that the Board collects the money for them  
4 and gives it to them.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: One has the benefit of  
6 the directors' services and co-ordinating mailing and  
7 various other matters, I suppose, that a head office would  
8 provide?

9 MR. LEGGE: I am sure that is correct, sir.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: They have an office of  
11 their own, the safety associations?

12 MR. LEGGE: Yes, in the Arcade Building.  
13 Basically in that building.

14 MR. ESTEY: All safety associations have  
15 their own offices in that building?

16 MR. LEGGE: In addition, they have teaching  
17 facilities. The I.A.P.A., has a modern school in Thorn-  
18 cliffe operating, and the electrical associations have  
19 one in Downsview, and these are modern, new 1966 facilities  
20 and brand new accommodation.

21 MR. ESTEY: Is their location being apart  
22 from the Board a matter of design or necessity because of  
23 the overcrowding in your own building?

24 MR. LEGGE: The overcrowding gave rise to  
25 moving them to new and modern accommodation, but it is  
26 better they have this kind of accommodation for lecture  
27 rooms, and the teaching facilities are special again and  
28 we do not have the facility at all.

29 MR. ESTEY: In the field of safety associa-  
30 tions and the reanalysis of it that the Board is in the





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2876

1 process of doing, as you describe it, did the Board make  
2 any policy with reference to the three point eight per-  
3 cent of the association funds, as to whether that is an  
4 average desirable expenditure on safety, or whether high  
5 or low, or is that under current study?

6 MR. LEGGE: There are two things in answer  
7 to that question. The Board thinks, in the conservative  
8 compensation concept, that it is much better that an  
9 accident be avoided rather than pay compensation, so  
10 therefore in theory and philosophy the Board would will-  
11 ingly allocate any kind of money to the teaching of safety,  
12 if it were convinced there was a cost effectiveness to  
13 this money. The Board would be willing to increase bud-  
14 gets in this area, not only on humanitarian grounds which  
15 is the first concern, but on the grounds of good business.  
16 The budget is not stationary as to percentage or total.  
17 If there were devices that warrant the expenditure and we  
18 were convinced they were worthwhile in avoiding accidents,  
19 if we made that decision we would spend whatever amount of  
20 money which in our professional opinion we thought was  
21 warranted.

22 MR. ESTEY: That I take it would indicate  
23 that three point eight percent is a current ratio which  
24 has resulted from the application of the present philosophy,  
25 but it isn't the end product, it doesn't dictate anything?

26 MR. LEGGE: That is correct, a perfect  
27 analysis.

28 MR. ESTEY: I want to change the subject  
29 to something else, Mr. Legge, and that is the question of  
30 Board investments. We have been listening to opinions of





Nethercut & Young

2877

Toronto, Ontario

1 investment representatives that would indicate that by  
2 other financial procedures, the need for investment may  
3 not be so much. To begin with it arises out of Section  
4 107, I think, the Board is to establish reserves, and I  
5 take it the Board does this in order to finance its oper-  
6 ation throughout the year, while collection is confined  
7 to one part of the year. In substance, that is why you  
8 do it?

9 MR. LEGGE: That is correct. There are  
10 many facets to this argument about investment, and the  
11 Board is cognizant of all of them and familiar with the  
12 pros and cons. As to the facts, the Board's income in  
13 1965 from investments which the Board had made was of the  
14 order of eleven million dollars, which is approximately  
15 ten percent of the assessment. Now an alternative to  
16 investing money which can be done when you have reserves  
17 and collect annually, would be to have monthly and quar-  
18 terly payments and this would mean the employer would  
19 theoretically have the use of the money for that period  
20 of time. If we were denied the advantage of making eleven  
21 million dollars a year on our investments, then the asses-  
22 sment would have to go up. It seems to have been generally  
23 conceded that the Board's investment policy has no risk  
24 to it, because they are a specified type of government  
25 backed trustee investments. There is no risk element in  
26 any real concensus of it. The second concensus is it is  
27 a rewarding operation and Mr. MacDonald and his team show  
28 formidable yields on the investments, therefore we feel  
29 the Board as a corporate business management operation,  
30 feel we do very well with the money, and it is a very





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2878

1 useful adjunct to the assessment income, and if we did  
2 not have it the assessment would have to increase to the  
3 tune of eleven million a year.

4 MR. ESTEY: The alternative, I take it,  
5 would be if you changed the base of collecting from the  
6 employer, the cost of collecting would increase substant-  
7 ially?

8 MR. LEGGE: I am sure you are right about  
9 that. You would have to increase staffs and computer  
10 systems.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You don't lose much by  
12 fly-by-night operators, or any operation that lasts for  
13 a few months and disappears, in this method of collecting  
14 your funds?

15 MR. LEGGE: We don't lose on our investments,  
16 sir. We do lose on the collection of our assessments and  
17 Mr. MacDonald could tell me the amount.

18 MR. MACDONALD: It was less than one per-  
19 cent of assessment last year, sir.

20 MR. LEGGE: That is the order and in any  
21 business operation would certainly be a manageable sum  
22 and always reached for. In the practice of law you would  
23 be very happy if you collected all but one percent of your  
24 fees.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: It appears to affect the  
26 construction industry more than anyone else, they are the  
27 ones who complained about it.

28 MR. LEGGE: We have notice of this.

29 MR. ESTEY: In this question of investments,  
30 Mr. Legge, do you think it would increase or place a





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2879

1 larger burden on the Board, if the powers of investment  
2 were broadened as the investment dealers have suggested  
3 to parallel the powers of the trustee act? Would it have  
4 a significant change?

5 MR. LEGGE: I don't think so. There is a  
6 salutary effect in the public mind to restrictive invest-  
7 ment to those guaranteed by the government. I think in  
8 reality the investment might be more lucrative in the  
9 yield and the risk hazard wouldn't be increased if you  
10 were restricted to trustee investments. We have special  
11 trustee investments now.

12 MR. ESTEY: Thank you, Mr. Legge, those are  
13 the only topics I wish to discuss with you. Thank you  
14 very much.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Legge.

16 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Commissioner, that concludes  
17 the submissions and briefs we have had filed with us, and  
18 I have notice of no other organizations who wish to say  
19 anything. We have one outstanding matter which has arisen  
20 because of a mailing problem and we may have to reconvene  
21 for some other submissions or to have resubmitted a brief  
22 we already have, so, therefore, subject to those special  
23 matters that would conclude the hearing we have now been  
24 conducting.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: I indicated at the begin-  
26 ning, in answer to some inquiries that were put, those  
27 who made submissions, if they felt it necessary at the  
28 end of inquiry to make comment on the character of the  
29 evidence that has been heard, would be allowed to do so.  
30 There has been no request to do so that I know of, but





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2880

1 possibly that opportunity should be given and if we are  
2 going to reconvene at a later period perhaps it could be  
3 done at that time, unless anybody wishes to proceed today.  
4 We could sit after lunch, if there are any of those organiza-  
5 tions here who wish to proceed after lunch they can be  
6 heard.

7 I am anxious that we don't simply have a  
8 repeating or going over again of the matters that have  
9 been contained in the submission or spoken in evidence.  
10 There is bound to be a conflict in any inquiry of this  
11 kind. Particularly in an inquiry of this kind, due to  
12 differing views of those represented. There will be  
13 difference of opinion between one section of the community  
14 or the other. That is the sort of thing I **will** have to  
15 decide. On the other hand, it may be that there has been  
16 evidence heard here or contained in some subsequent sub-  
17 missions that some of the parties may feel they should  
18 have the opportunity to reply to. That will be given, so  
19 if anyone desires to do so I would appreciate it if they  
20 would let me know.

21 MR. GALLAGHER: Mr. Commissioner, our  
22 organization is grateful and we would like to have an  
23 opportunity to come back in the way you indicated. Not  
24 at this moment, but at a later date.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: You are aware of the  
26 limitations I am seeking to propose.

27 MR. GALLAGHER: Yes, Mr. Commissioner. We  
28 will not enter into a controversy about **personalities**.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't want repetition,  
30 that is all. You are not prepared to do that today, I





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2881

1 take it?

2 MR. GALLAGHER: No, sir.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Then we will adjourn.

4 MR. ESTEY: Mr. Osler, would you wish to  
5 have such an opportunity?

6 MR. OSLER: If you would like to ask any  
7 questions or have any explanation of the brief which I  
8 can give, or comment, I shall be delighted to be here.

9 MR. ESTEY: We then would circulate a notice  
10 of the time.

11 MR. CRAIG: I will have to consult with our  
12 executive board, but I am confident the federation would  
13 also wish to add a few words.

14 MR. ESTEY: We will send out a notice  
15 giving you advance notice of the date we will hear the  
16 final submissions.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: That appears to complete  
18 our work for today, until such time as you receive notice  
19 of a subsequent hearing. In view of the communication we  
20 have had you weren't able to get in touch with this union  
21 today? In view of the communication we have had today  
22 from this other party, it is unlikely that the hearing  
23 will be prior to the next two weeks. It will not be in  
24 the third and fourth week in November as I will be in my  
25 own court. Maybe on the 28th, 29th and 30th of November  
26 we will be able to resume. You can keep that in mind.  
27 The Commission is adjourned.

28

29

30









Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

IN THE MATTER OF The Public Inquiries  
Act, R.S.O., 1960, Ch. 323

- and -

IN THE MATTER OF an Inquiry Into and  
Report Upon The Workmen's Compensation  
Act.

BEFORE: The Honourable Mr. Justice W. A.  
McGillivray, Commissioner, at  
Room 200, 67 Richmond Street  
West, Toronto, Ontario, on Monday  
and Tuesday, 28 and 29 November, 1966

APPEARANCES

W. Z. Estey and)  
H. D. Guthrie )

Counsel to the Commission

G. A. Johnston

Secretary

ALSO PRESENT:

28 Nov 1966

G. C. Butterill

Canadian National Railways et al

J. Ostrowski

Private Appearance

29 Nov 1966

W. R. Burnett

Canadian National Railways, et al

W. Draper and)  
W. R. Kerr )

The Workmen's Compensation Board

C. G. Gibson

Department of Labour of Ontario

J. H. Craigs and)  
H. Weisbach )

Ontario Federation of Labour

C. R. Osler, Q.C.

International Nickel Co. of Canada Ltd

J. Devlin, R. Hounsome,) Ontario Legislative Committee,  
J. Martindale and F. J.) International Railway Brother-  
Culliton ) hoods.

G. J. Samson

Construction Safety Association





Nethercut & Young

I N D E X

Toronto, Ontario

	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
1	28 Nov 1966	
2	Submission of Canadian National Railways, et al	2883
3	Submission of Mr. Ostrowski	2892
4	Submission of City of Toronto	2898
5	29 Nov 1966	
6	Submission of Workmen's Compensation Board	2911
7	Submission of Ontario Department of Labour	2931
8	Submission of Ontario Legislative Committee, International Railway Brotherhoods	2935
9	Submission of Canadian National Railways, et al	2957
10	Submission of International Nickel Company of Canada, Ltd.	2965
11	Submission of Ontario Federation of Labour	2969
12	Submission of Construction Safety Associa- tion	2976
13	Submission of Workmen's Compensation Board	2982
14		
15	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	
16	No. 49 Reports of Construction Safety Association and Industrial Accident Prevention Association	2912
17	No. 50 Report on Grants to Prevention Associations	2912
18	No. 51 Report for 1966 on FPAPA, OPPMSA, LAPA, TSA, CSAEUSA, MAPA	2912
19	No. 52 Report of a Study of Construction Safety Advertising Penetration dated November 1965 conducted by Construc- tion Safety Associations	2981
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2883

L/SS 1 ---On commencing at ten o'clock a.m.

2

3 MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Commissioner, it was  
4 announced by notice to all who had attended at earlier  
5 hearings or had submitted briefs that an opportunity  
6 would be afforded today at ten o'clock for any person who  
7 had already appeared to reply to any submissions which  
8 had been made. We have this morning Mr. and Mrs.  
9 Owstrowski with us, and Mr. Butterill of the railways.  
10 Mr. Butterill, I know, wanted to speak to a matter of  
11 wording of a proposed amendment relating to the right of  
12 appeal. Perhaps he would like to start.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: We haven't heard from  
14 two others who indicated they wanted to appear, Mr.  
15 Gallagher, the Ontario Labour Federation, and Mr. Osler,  
16 International Nickel.

17 MR. GUTHRIE: Yes, I think Mr. Osler, Mr.  
18 Gallagher of the Federation of Labour, and also there was  
19 some indication that Mine, Mill might have wanted to  
20 come. They have all received notice. I noticed in the  
21 press that Mr. Gallagher is engaged at some other  
22 meeting this morning.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: What we will do is we  
24 will carry on, and we will be sitting tomorrow, in any  
25 event, and they can make their submissions then if they  
26 so desire.

27 MR. BUTTERILL: I don't think, Mr.  
28 Commissioner, this is actual reply, but when we put in  
29 our recent submission we were asked with respect to  
30 appeals to suggest to the Commission just how this





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2884

1 amendment could be accomplished.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Which amendment?

3 MR. BUTTERILL: Which gives the right of  
4 appeal to the decision of the Board. I drafted out an  
5 amendment, Mr. Commissioner, to the Section 72, and we  
6 have modified the right of appeal to this extent, that  
7 you can only appeal on the basis of the Board stating a  
8 case of its own motion or in the discretion of the Board  
9 on the motion of an employer or worker.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: I understand the first  
11 one. What is the second one?

12 MR. BUTTERILL: Maybe if I just read the  
13 proposed amendment it would clarify itself. I suggest  
14 that there be another subsection added to Section 72 to  
15 provide that "The Board may of its own motion or in its  
16 discretion on the motion of an employer or workman state  
17 a case in writing for the opinion of the Court of Appeal  
18 upon any question which, in the opinion of the Board, is  
19 a question as to its jurisdiction or a question of law."  
20 In other words, an employer or workman hasn't got an  
21 immediate right to have a case stated; it is still in the  
22 discretion of the Board whether or not it states a case.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: That has perhaps more to  
24 recommend itself than the original motion. There seems  
25 to be reluctance on both labour and industry to get  
26 involved in the work of the courts.

27 MR. BUTTERILL: We appreciate that, but we  
28 thought that there may be some case for the Board itself  
29 to state a case; and even in the case where the employer  
30 or workman wanted to state it, it is still within the





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2885

1 discretion of the Board.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you please read it  
3 to me again?

4 MR. BUTTERILL: "The Board may of its own  
5 motion or in its discretion on the motion of an employer  
6 or workman state a case in writing for the opinion of  
7 the Court of Appeal upon any question which, in the  
8 opinion of the Board, is a question as to its jurisdiction  
9 or a question of law." In other words, if an employer  
10 or employee thought it should be stated they can so  
11 indicate, but it is still in the discretion of the Board  
12 whether it is stated.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: You have a lot of  
14 experience in asking for the right to appeal, but it  
15 seems to me in almost any case they can find some point  
16 of law in the manner in which the case can be heard.  
17 Perhaps it should be left to the Board whether it is a  
18 point of law or not. They don't get leave in every case,  
19 but they get leave in most cases.

20 MR. BUTTERILL: The other side of the  
21 question is that I think it might give some assistance  
22 to the Board in a difficult case.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: I can understand that,  
24 yes.

25 MR. BUTTERILL: If we eliminate stating a  
26 case on the motion of an employer or workman, leaving it  
27 entirely to the Board, I don't think we would have any  
28 objection to that, Mr. Commissioner. Maybe I could  
29 just put in brackets those words, "or in its discretion  
30 on the motion of an employer or workman", that we might





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2886

1 take those words out.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: This is a joint brief?

3 MR. BUTTERILL: This is a joint brief of the  
4 railways. Mr. Burnett couldn't be here, so he asked me  
5 to come.

6 MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Butterill, in Schedule  
7 "B" to your brief you did set out a draft clause earlier,  
8 and there was a clause which provided for a right of  
9 representation to any association representing a class.  
10 You remember that?

11 MR. BUTTERILL: Yes.

12 MR. GUTHRIE: You would leave that out?

13 MR. BUTTERILL: No, I would leave that in.  
14 I have added that point you have mentioned, a subsection  
15 (6), and I have also put in subsection (7), the one about  
16 the provisions of The Judicature Act and the Rules that  
17 apply.

18 MR. GUTHRIE: Yes, I see that now.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: It really doesn't matter  
20 whether the last part is in or out because they can  
21 always make representations to the Board to state a  
22 question of law.

23 MR. BUTTERILL: That is right, sir. There  
24 is just one other point we thought we should mention in  
25 our brief which I don't think was mentioned at the time  
26 of our original submission. This is the question of the  
27 amendment to Section 7 (2) and Section 9 (4) providing  
28 for the time limitation within which the election has to  
29 be made. It seems that under Section 9 (4) the Board can  
30 extend the time at which election can be made, and this





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2887

1 in certain cases could result in, say, the Schedule 2  
2 employer or the Board being statute barred in bringing  
3 an action.

4 MR. GUTHRIE: There is no protection  
5 afforded there.

6 MR. BUTTERILL: We don't think so in our  
7 interpretation, and we in our brief have suggested an  
8 amendment to the Act which would, we think, protect the  
9 Board and the employer.

10 MR. GUTHRIE: Where is the power to extend  
11 the time?

12 MR. BUTTERILL: It is right at the end of  
13 Section 7 (2), Mr. Guthrie.

14 MR. GUTHRIE: Yes, I see.

15 MR. BUTTERILL: "or within such longer  
16 period as either before or after the expiration of such  
17 three months the Board may allow."

18 MR. GUTHRIE: Would you like to read that  
19 portion of your brief into the record? I don't think  
20 it has been previously read in.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Did you have some  
22 reference to Section 9 (4), too?

23 MR. BUTTERILL: 9 (4) is the section  
24 pursuant to which the employer gets a right of  
25 subrogation.

26 MR. GUTHRIE: It is Section 9, subsection  
27 (4), is it not?

28 MR. BUTTERILL: Yes.





Nethercut & Young

2888

Toronto, Ontario

2/FJN/SS

1

This appears at page 8.

2

THE COMMISSIONER: 9, subsection (3), isn't  
it?

3

MR. BUTTERILL: 9 (4), actually, Mr.  
Commissioner, deals with the time to be given.

4

THE COMMISSIONER: But you are subrogated  
under 9 (3).

5

MR. BUTTERILL: That is right.

6

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it seems to me that  
in a previous report, maybe that of Justice Roach, he  
felt there should be some protection.

7

MR. BUTTERILL: I think that is right.

8

THE COMMISSIONER: If not in this, then in  
Mr. Justice Tysoe's.

9

MR. BUTTERILL: I saw it in one of the  
reports.

10

THE COMMISSIONER: I think so too.

11

MR. BUTTERILL: You could appreciate it  
if the Board delayed for over a year, your lordship.  
You would be out of court under The Highway Traffic Act.

12

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

13

Do you want to read in that portion of your  
brief?

14

MR. GUTHRIE: I think Mr. Butterill is  
going to read that paragraph.

15

MR. BUTTERILL: This appears, Mr. Commissioner,  
on page 8, Section 3, of our brief entitled "Election -  
Time Limitation".

16

By Section 7 (2) and Section 9 (4) of the  
Act the time limit within which an election to claim





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2889

1 compensation is to be made is three months. However,  
2 it is to be noted that this time limit may be extended  
3 for an indefinite period by the Board. It may be the  
4 intent expressed in the Section that the power to extend  
5 shall apply only to fatal cases. As the exercise by the  
6 Board or the employer, as the case may be, of the subro-  
7 gation rights given by Section 9 (3) commences with the  
8 election, some problems may be created if the election is  
9 not made within the time limit for action against a  
10 third party who allegedly caused or contributed to the  
11 injury or death of the workman.

12 The initial period of three months creates  
13 difficulty in this respect if the limitation period for  
14 any action against the third party is three months or  
15 less. A limitation of three months exists in relation  
16 to actions arising out of non-repair of highways.

17 With reference to the matter of extension of  
18 the time set forth in Section 7 (2) it is assumed that  
19 the Board would not prejudice its rights to take action  
20 by an extension beyond the applicable limitation period  
21 in those cases where the action is to be brought by the  
22 Board. Nor do we believe that the Board would intentionally  
23 prejudice the employer by an extension in those cases  
24 where the action is to be brought by the Employer; but  
25 we are of the opinion that the Act should contain express  
26 protection of the Employer in this regard.

27 There would seem to be several ways in  
28 which the above objectives could be accomplished but it  
29 is our respectful submission that the above difficulties





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2890

1 created by the present subsection (2) of Section 7 can  
2 be remedied by altering this subsection and adding an  
3 additional subsection as indicated in Schedule C hereto  
4 attached.

5 There would seem to be some ambiguity in the  
6 wording of Section 7 (2) creating some doubt whether  
7 the right to extend the time for election applies to non-  
8 fatal cases. Fairness to the workman would seem to  
9 justify any necessary clarification to make such an  
10 extension possible.

11 The proposed alterations would not appear  
12 to work any hardship on the workman and would remove  
13 the risk of a procedural bar creating an immunity for a  
14 third party who in fact caused or contributed to the  
15 injury of the workman.

16 That reference to the ambiguity ---

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Schedule C refers to two  
18 months. Isn't the period three months?

19 MR. BUTTERILL: It is three months in the  
20 other, but we put in two months there, Mr. Commissioner,  
21 because we had in mind that you have to bring an action,  
22 say, under The Ontario Highway Traffic Act, in three  
23 months. So this is one statute we know of where the  
24 three months limitation period could bar it, so if we  
25 made it two months we would still have a month in which  
26 to bring our action if it were connected with the  
27 Ontario highways.

28 We tried to accomplish this by subsection  
29 (3) of our proposed amendment which says:

30 "The Board shall not grant an extension





1 of time under subsection (2) if such extension would  
2 prejudice the Board or Employer in regard to any right of  
3 action under Section 9, subsection (3) being barred by  
4 reason of the expiry of a limitation period for the  
5 bringing of an action against a third party who caused,  
6 or contributed to, the injuries of the employee."

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Supposing you left it at  
8 three months. I mean to say, you might get caught for  
9 the odd day at the end of the three-month period.

10 MR. BUTTERILL: You can't protect against  
11 everything.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: No. In an odd case you  
13 might get caught, but I mean if it was within the three  
14 months you would generally have time to get your notice  
15 out.

16 MR. BUTTERILL: I think we would be happy  
17 with the three months, as long as it was restricted and  
18 there was no restriction beyond that time. I would  
19 think that people should be able to bring an action  
20 within the three-month period. If you give them more  
21 time, then they take it. It is a human failing.

22 MR. GUTHRIE: There certainly could be  
23 difficulties in the case of a fatal accident of  
24 ascertaining executors and so on to make the decision  
within that two-month period.

25 MR. BUTTERILL: This is right.

26 MR. GUTHRIE: Is that everything, Mr.  
27 Butterill?

28 MR. BUTTERILL: That is everything.

29 MR. GUTHRIE: Thank you very much.





1                           Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Ostrowski has  
2 indicated that he would like an opportunity to speak to  
3 the Commission again.

4                           MR. OSTROWSKI: My lord, I do not dare to  
5 suggest any wording of any changes in the Act. I seek  
6 to present only general ideas and feelings and point to  
7 some obsolete or unjust parts of The Workmen's  
8 Compensation Act. I am more than sure that the probable  
9 expression of it would be your lordship's decision how to  
10 put it into the Act, only some suggestions which were  
11 made during these hearings would need some clarification.

12                          First, I would like to express my own  
13 opinion that the right of appeal should be in a  
14 separate section in the Act, not an amendment to a  
15 certain section referring to a certain part of the Act.

16                          THE COMMISSIONER: You think the right of  
17 appeal should be a section of the Act rather than in the  
18 regulations?

19                          MR. OSTROWSKI: Rather in the regulations  
20 than in referring to a certain part of the Act. It  
21 should be very centrally clear in saying how and where  
22 and so on.

23                          THE COMMISSIONER: Are you talking now  
24 about the existing right of appeal or are you talking  
25 about the right of appeal to the courts?

26                          MR. OSTROWSKI: To the courts. That was my  
27 first point of my submission.

28                          THE COMMISSIONER: When I say the existing  
29 right of appeal, there have been submissions made that  
30 even the existing right should be clearly stated in the





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2893

1 regulations so that claimants know what their rights  
2 are.

3 MR. OSTROWSKI: That was my next point,  
4 your lordship.

5 Certainly determining the right of  
6 interested parties in the administrative appeal would  
7 also need clarifying, your lordship, to make it very  
8 clear to the workmen or to the interested parties what  
9 their rights are, what they can base it on and certainly  
10 comparing with the proceedings of the court as we under-  
11 stand it. I think that there is no reason an appeal  
12 could be made without foreknowledge of the facts, of the  
13 files of the Workmen's Compensation Board, of medical  
14 opinion, and all facts regarding the point of appeal.  
15 So this should be, to my humble opinion, established  
16 also very clearly in the Act.

17 Certainly as I understand it --- I will not  
18 repeat the things which I have already recorded --- but  
19 as I understand in the invitation or notice to today's  
20 meeting I was also given the right to answer to any  
21 briefs and recommendations made by other parties. I will  
22 come only to that famous privilege of medical records or  
23 all records of the Compensation Board.

24 I read very carefully the brief presented  
25 by the Ontario Medical Association and I think that this  
26 brief is contradicting even some existing parts of the  
27 Act because if you will look at Section 23 of the Act  
28 you will find that where a workman has upon the request  
29 of his employer submitted himself for examination or has  
30 been examined by a duly-qualified medical practitioner





1 selected by himself a copy of the report of the medical  
2 practitioner as to the workman's condition has been  
3 furnished in the former case by the employer to the  
4 workman and in the latter by the workman to the employer.  
5 So there is no privilege at that stage.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Just hold it a moment.

7 MR. OSTROWSKI: So I understand that whenever  
8 a workman has to submit his examination to the employer  
9 or vice-versa, the employer to the workman, the medical  
10 opinion is sent in in full to one of the parties. So at  
11 that time there is no privilege, there is no reason for  
not  
12 privilege. Why should this privilege/be extended when  
13 the proceedings are going higher up to the Workmen's  
14 Compensation Board?

15 I can't understand also how the requirement  
16 or request of the Ontario Medical Association can ask for  
17 full privilege of all medical reports even in summary  
18 form. It is a fact established --- and I will not  
19 repeat what I have already presented --- but it is an  
established fact that the first duty is to the patient,  
20 not to the Board, not to anybody but to the patient.  
But for some reason of rather daily convenience the  
22 Medical Association insists that it will make easier  
the life of the practitioner in the small town, as they  
24 are usually referred to, to make this report privileged.  
I certainly have not the opportunity to go through the  
26 libraries and quote all this opinion expressed many,  
27 many times by the courts, but recently I had the chance  
28 to read the medical records of 1948, December, page 560,  
29 which deals with privileged communications.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2895

1 THE COMMISSIONER: What are you reading from?

2 MR. OSTROWSKI: Medical Records. It is from  
3 December, 1948.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Medical records of what?

5 MR. OSTROWSKI: Medical Records. That is the  
6 periodical.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: That is a periodical  
8 called Medical Records?

9 MR. OSTROWSKI: Yes, and they refer to the  
10 case of Wolfe vs. the People and the Colorado Supreme  
11 Court 187-P to D-26, and in that judgment the Supreme  
12 Court of Colorado said:

13 "The statute is solely for  
14 the protection of the patients, not the  
15 physician".

16 It is one of the most clearly-expressed opinions I ever  
17 ran across. They said expressively that the statute of  
18 the privileged information is solely for the protection  
19 of the patient, not of the physician. Why the Medical  
20 Association insists that they should always be  
21 protected I can't really understand.

22 In the brief submitted by the Ontario  
23 Medical Association they say that the purpose of the  
24 report is to assist the doctors working in the claims  
25 department. Is it so? Is it true? Is that the true  
26 purpose of what a doctor has to do? Certainly he has  
27 to assist, but in a clear, true and open way, not hiding  
28 anything from anyone. I have heard, I think, Mr. Melvin  
29 the vice-president of the Ontario Medical Association  
30 whose reason for this privilege and the necessity of





Toronto, Ontario

1 privileged information submitted by the doctors was in  
2 technical language at first and then some abbreviation.  
3 One of them was that some of the workmen were offended  
4 by the appellation "S.O.B.". It is not much for a doctor  
5 to write "Short of breath" instead of "S.O.B.", and  
6 because of that asking for the privileged information.

7 Secondly, who was reading this information?  
8 Usually when it comes to the appeal the workman doesn't  
9 have them, he asks his lawyer or his doctor or he goes  
10 to the Workmen's Compensation Board. Why . the  
11 technicality of the opinion should justify the secrecy  
12 of that opinion I don't know. This is beyond my humble  
13 understanding, and that is why we are opposing it.

14 I think also it looks to me very ridiculous  
15 --- maybe I am using not the proper word, but please  
16 forgive me, my lord, for any of my mistakes in English,  
17 but it looks to me ridiculous that the Workmen's  
18 Compensation Board accept such opinions of the Medical  
19 Association just to keep unstained the image of a  
20 doctor in a community when he is writing a different  
21 opinion or a differently worded opinion to the Workmen's  
22 Compensation Board. I think that the Workmen's  
23 Compensation Board should be first of all interested ---

24 THE COMMISSIONER: It is not his reputation  
25 in the community: They feel that he won't be as frank  
26 in a restricted community where he has to depend wholly  
27 on the community.

28 MR. OSTROWSKI: His first duty is to be  
29 frank in all details to the patient and I think that  
30 this does not change at all the reality of the duty





1 of the doctor to the patient.

2 Another thing which comes to my mind is  
3 also that the difference of opinion or difference in  
4 wording of the opinion complicates the dealings with  
5 the compensation board. Why? If an injured workman is  
6 getting very optimistic for him, opinion from a doctor,  
7 and then faces a board which refuses him compensation,  
8 he will certainly blame either the compensation board  
9 or the doctor. Why? If he gets that opinion first,  
10 frankly, without any secrecy, without any withholding  
11 of any facts, he will maybe not appeal at all. He  
12 trusts his doctor in 99 percent of the cases. Why should  
13 he receive something which is not exactly what is  
14 presented to the compensation board? That thing, to my  
15 opinion, is only helping to create more cases, more  
16 unnecessary litigation, if it could be so called, with  
17 the compensation board where it could be very easily  
18 avoided by the simple fact by the statement of the  
19 truth to all interested parties that all of them will  
20 have the same material.

21 That is the main thing which I wanted to answer as  
22 far as privilege is concerned and as far as the right of  
23 appeal is concerned.

24 Thank you, my lord, for permitting me.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Ostrowski.

26 MR.GUTHRIE: Does anyone else have any wish  
27 to address the Commission? If so, would they care to  
28 identify themselves and come forward, please?

29 It was expected that the chiropractors  
30 would be present today to rebut some material, Mr.





Nethercut & Young

2898

Toronto, Ontario

1 Commissioner, and it was thought that the writer of the  
2 brief on accident proneness, Jean Surry, might have  
3 attended, but evidently there is no one else present,  
4 Mr. Commissioner, who wishes to speak at this time.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Has Mr. Kerr some  
6 statements he wishes to make?

7 MR. KERR: Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Draper will  
8 be with us tomorrow morning. He could not be here today  
9 but he will be with us tomorrow morning to present some  
10 information on statistics that are provided through the  
11 safety associations.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

13 MR. GUTHRIE: Well, tomorrow, sir, we have  
14 the railway brotherhoods, International Railway Brother-  
15 hoods.

16 One matter that has not been taken up  
17 before you, sir, as yet, is the brief of the Corporation  
18 of the City of Toronto, and I thought it might be  
19 appropriate to read that into the record. It follows on  
20 from Mr. Butterill's comments about third party cases and  
21 subrogation.

22 This is the submission of the Corporation  
23 of the City of Toronto.

24 The Corporation of the City of Toronto is,  
25 save for the matters hereinafter mentioned, content with  
26 the position of the City as an employer under Schedule 2  
27 of the Act, individually liable to pay compensation.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: That is the first time we  
29 have heard about that, isn't it?

30 MR. GUTHRIE: Yes. This is changing now to





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2899

1 a different point, sir.

2                   The City of Toronto feels, however, as it did  
3 when a similar enquiry was conducted by The Honourable  
4 Mr. Justice Roach in 1949-50, that appropriate amendments  
5 should be made to The Workmen's Compensation Act to  
6 clarify the position of workmen and employers under  
7 Schedule 2 in the field of Third Party Liability.

8                   1. When an employee to whom the Act applies  
9 sustains an injury arising out of and in the course of  
10 his employment, which would entitle him or his  
11 dependents to relief against some person other than his  
12 employer, he may choose to treat the matter entirely  
13 as a private one and claim nothing under the Act or he  
14 may claim compensation under the Act. Section 9 (2) of  
15 the Act provides that if the workman enforces his own  
16 rights and recovers less than the compensation to which  
17 he would have been entitled, he may then claim the  
18 difference. Section 9 (2) should be amended to clarify  
19 whether it applies to settlements before judgment.

20                   Throughout the Act, the word "compensation"  
21 is used with special reference to the money which is  
22 paid to the workman in lieu of his wages, but it should  
23 be noted that the workman is also entitled to medical  
24 aid under Section 51. The Act makes it quite clear that  
25 compensation and medical aid are two different things,  
26 as for example, in Section 5 of the Act. It would appear  
27 to be the unintentional result that a workman can enforce  
28 his own rights and also receive medical aid under the  
29 Statute. It is, therefore, submitted that: -

30





Nethercut & Young

2900

Toronto, Ontario

1 (a) Section 9 (1) should be amended to read  
2 as follows:

3 "Where an accident arising out of and  
4 in the course of his employment happens  
5 to a workman under such circumstances  
6 as entitle him or his dependents to an  
7 action against some person other than  
8 his employer, the workman and his  
9 dependents, if entitled to benefits  
10 under this part may claim such benefits  
11 or may bring such action."

12 I think the change of "compensation" in the present  
13 section to "benefits" in the proposed amendment, that  
14 is the only change that I can see. So that it is not  
15 limited to compensation only but would include medical  
16 aid as well, and then a corresponding amendment is  
17 suggested to Section 51, subsection (1) which has been  
18 changed to read in part as follows:

19 "Every workman entitled to and  
20 claiming benefits under this part...."

21 and the point is the same.

22 I don't really see the need at the moment.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: It means that sometimes  
24 a workman may pursue his action and recover without ever  
25 having a claim for the cost of medical attention and yet---

26 MR. GUTHRIE: Yes, I see that point, sir,  
27 but I am not sure of the need for the change in Section  
28 51.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: And yet the Section 2  
30 employer would be stuck for it.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2901

/BL/SS

1

MR. GUTHRIE: 51 is the section which  
2 entitles a workman to medical aid. It is not related  
3 directly to third party liability at all, and I would  
4 think that the way it is it is better for them.

5

THE COMMISSIONER: This difference between  
6 the words "compensation" and "benefits" goes a long way  
7 back. Compensation is something that a workman is  
8 entitled to as a matter of right; benefits come under  
9 welfare legislation, and, generally speaking, the Act has  
10 kept the word out, although it may be necessary in this  
11 particular instance. It may be important.

12

MR. GUTHRIE: I don't think the word matters  
13 to them as long as it is some word which indicates it  
14 includes medical aid under Section 9. I think it is an  
15 important point. You could say "entitled to compensation  
16 or medical aid under Section 9 (1)" and that would answer  
17 their question, I think.

18

The brief goes on:

19

2. Where a municipal employee is injured under  
20 circumstances which may possibly involve liability of a  
21 third person, the present provisions of the Act with  
22 respect to election are not entirely satisfactory to  
23 this municipality. In many cases, election has been  
24 postponed pending negotiations by the workman with the  
25 third party or his insurers, and in the intervening  
26 period, the municipality is not usually a party to such  
27 negotiations. It would appear that the scheme of election  
28 under the Act, while possibly suited to industries  
29 under Schedule 1 of the Act, should be revised with  
30 respect to industries under Schedule 2, to provide that





Nethercut & Young

2902

Toronto, Ontario

1 a workman thereunder shall elect not to claim benefits  
2 under the Act within three months or such further time  
3 as the Board may allow, failing which he shall be  
4 presumed to have elected to claim such benefits. In  
5 addition, the Act should be amended to invalidate settle-  
6 ments made by the workman before he has elected not to  
7 claim benefits under the Act. Further, where the workman  
8 has elected not to claim benfits under the Act and  
9 proposes to enter into any settlement with a third party,  
10 that settlement, it is submitted, should be approved by  
11 The Workmen's Compensation Board so that the Board may  
12 be satisfied that the settlement is in the best interests  
13 of the workman or his dependants in the event of a claim  
14 under Section 9 (2). Where a workman elects not to  
15 claim benefits under the Act, the Act should be amended  
16 to bar any claim to benefits under the Act for injuries  
17 or damages which were not apparent or reasonably  
18 foreseeable at the time of the election.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: I understand why the  
20 Board might be interested if settlement was made for less  
21 than what the compensation would be. If the settlement  
22 was made for more than what the compensation would be,  
23 they would have no concern.

24 MR. GUTHRIE: That is right.  
25

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Earlier in that paragraph  
27 they seek to have it presumed, if he hasn't done anything  
28 within three months, that he has elected to claim  
29 benefits. But that wouldn't give them the right to sue  
30 in that time, would it, the Schedule 2 employer? They  
say that the Act should be amended to invalidate





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2903

1 settlements made by the workman before he has elected not  
2 to claim benefits. Well, they are going pretty far in  
3 that. However, we will consider it.

4 MR. GUTHRIE: Paragraphs 1 and 2 have  
5 dealt with suggested changes in the Act to deal with  
6 difficulties which arise where the workman sues in his  
7 own name to secure his rights against the third party.  
8 The principal submissions of the City, however, deal with  
9 the situation where the City, as a Schedule 2 employer,  
10 individually liable to pay compensation and other  
11 benefits, brings an action pursuant to the provisions of  
12 Section 9 (3) of the Act. For convenience, this section  
13 is set out hereunder:

14 "If the workman or his dependants elect  
15 to claim compensation under this Part,  
16 the employer, if he is individually  
17 liable to pay it, and the Board, if the  
18 compensation is payable out of the  
19 accident fund, are subrogated to the  
20 rights of the workman or his dependants,  
21 and may maintain an action in his or  
22 their names or in the name of the Board  
23 against the person against whom the  
24 action lies, and any sum recovered from  
25 him by the Board shall form part of  
26 the accident fund."

27 It is to be observed that as the section now reads, the  
28 Workmen's Compensation Board may bring an action in its  
29 name if the compensation is payable out of the accident  
30 fund, but a Schedule 2 employer is given only the





Nethercut & Young

2904

Toronto, Ontario

1 statutory right to bring an action in the name of the  
2 workman or his dependants.

3 In the City's view, it is not important that  
4 Schedule 2 employers be given the right to bring an  
5 action in the name of the employer, but it is important  
6 that the Statute make quite clear, by appropriate  
7 amendments, that all payments to or on behalf of the work-  
8 man or his dependants made by the employer are  
9 recoverable in such an action.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: That is about the same  
11 thing they were referring to before about the medical  
12 expenses, isn't it?

13 MR.GUTHRIE: It is the same thought, yes.

14 It has been argued that a Schedule 2  
15 employer, in bringing an action under Section 9 (3), can  
16 only stand in the place of the workman and can merely  
17 enforce his rights. If this is so, then it can be argued  
18 that only the items of loss suffered by the workman  
19 can be recovered. If the workman has not been put to  
20 any medical expense and has not lost wages because  
21 his employer has paid medical aid and compensation, then,  
22 so the argument runs, the workman has not suffered  
23 damages to the extent of such payments.

24 The Workmen's Compensation Act was never  
25 intended to free a tortfeasor from any of the damages  
26 which he would have been liable to pay but for the Act.  
27 Section 9 (3) of the Act was intended for the benefit  
28 of the employer or the Board and should not operate to  
29 excuse a tortfeasor from part of his liability.

30 It is therefore submitted as a





Nethercut & Young

2905

Toronto, Ontario

1 recommendation to your Commission that the Act be  
2 amended to give a Schedule 2 employer a definite  
3 statutory right to claim from the tortfeasor in a  
4 subrogated action all payments made to or on behalf of  
5 the workman or his dependants, plus administration  
6 expenses paid under Section 119 of the Act by the  
7 employer.

8. In the City's view, it is desirable that  
9 the Statute make it clear that the employer is entitled  
10 to bring an action in the name of the workman for all  
11 of the benefits provided by the employer, rather than  
12 attempting to achieve such a result by permitting the  
13 employer to sue in his own name. A jury would be  
14 influenced in some cases by the presence of the employer  
15 as a party plaintiff, particularly in the case of a  
16 corporation as large as the City of Toronto. Indeed, it  
17 is further submitted that actions brought by Schedule 2  
18 employers in the name of the workman should be tried  
19 without a jury. It is rare that a jury will not be  
20 aware that the real plaintiff is the employer and not  
21 the workman who has already been compensated. In view  
22 of the type of employer coming within Schedule 2, a  
23 real danger exists that the intention of the Legislature,  
24 expressed in Section 9 (3) of the Act, will be  
25 frustrated.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: I have never understood  
27 the basis on which the municipality escaped jury actions,  
28 why they should any more than railway companies.

29 MR. GUTHRIE: He is just coming to that now  
30 in the brief.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2906

1                   Actions arising out of non-repair of a  
2                   highway are now tried without a jury and juries are  
3                   dispensed with where mention of insurance is made.  
4                   Juries should not be put in a position where they may be  
5                   influenced improperly by extraneous matters.

6                   THE COMMISSIONER: They don't have to  
7                   mention insurance to juries any ~~more~~; they just assume  
8                   they are insured.

9                   5. MR. GUTHRIE: It is submitted that the Act  
10                  should be amended by adding a statutory provision that  
11                  any damages in excess of all monies paid out by a  
12                  Schedule 2 employer in respect of the accident, recovered  
13                  by the employer in any action brought by him under  
14                  Section 9 (3), less a proper allowance for legal  
15                  expenses, shall be paid over to the workman, provided  
16                  that such payment shall stand as a credit against any  
17                  further claims by the workman for the same injury or  
18                  disability.

19                  That is a rather interesting one. I think  
20                  the practice of the Board, although there is nothing in  
21                  the Act, is to pay over to the workman any excess it  
22                  recovers. There is one employer I can recall whose  
23                  practice is to the contrary.

24                  THE COMMISSIONER: I think employers under  
25                  Schedule 2 do what they are seeking to do there, except  
26                  they do it by agreement with the workman, that this  
27                  money will stand against any further claim for compensa-  
28                  tion until such time as it is exhausted. It might be as  
29                  well to put it into the provisions of the Act. It seems  
30                  if you recover more than the compensation paid it should





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2907

1 be paid back but with the provision that it should stand  
2 against any further compensation it is necessary to award.

3 MR. GUTHRIE: I think it was the Bell  
4 Telephone who had an objection to this and they wanted  
5 to justify the reason for their objection because of a  
6 press comment which put them in an unfavourable light,  
7 that where they had sickness benefits it may be proper  
8 for the employer to have some discretion. I am not sure  
9 what their point is, but they were opposed to this  
10 recommendation of the City, I know that.

11 In a small percentage of cases, the employer  
12 recovers a much larger amount than he has paid out, by  
13 reason of the fact that a substantial amount is awarded  
14 as general damages. In the City of Toronto, the surplus  
15 is given to the workman, and a by-law has been passed  
16 to this effect. It is felt that the employer should not  
17 profit as a result of any injury to an individual  
18 employee. The Legislature has already permitted the City  
19 of Toronto to follow this policy of paying any surplus  
20 to the workman by enacting private legislation -- The  
21 City of Toronto Act (2), 1946 C. 142, S.6.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: They got that legislation  
23 through where they are going to pay it over, and now  
24 they want further protection.

25 6. MR. GUTHRIE: In the alternative, the  
26 legislature could, it is submitted, provide that an  
27 agreement between the employer and the workman, that in  
28 consideration of payment over to the workman of such  
29 excess monies, the said excess monies are to stand as a  
30 credit against any further claims by the workman for the





Nethercut & Young

2908

Toronto, Ontario

1 same injury or disability, is valid, notwithstanding the  
2 provisions of S.18 of the Act.

3 This is to do the same thing by agreement.

4 7. It is submitted that it would be useful  
5 and beneficial that the legislation be amended to  
6 provide that, in subrogated actions brought by Schedule 2  
7 employers, a list of Workmen's Compensation Awards and  
8 medical aid payments which have been authorized by the  
9 Board, certified by a proper officer of the Board, shall  
10 be prima facie evidence that the workman has incurred  
11 such expenses in respect of any given accident.

12 Section 73 doesn't really go that far.  
13 There is a provision for certified copies of entries  
14 in any book or record of the Board. Well, perhaps it  
15 would go far enough, sir, because the amount paid out  
16 would be a matter of entry or record in the Board's  
17 books, so that might be sufficient as it is.

18 8. Section 52 of the Act provides that every  
19 physician, surgeon, hospital official or other person,  
20 attending, consulted respecting, or having the care of,  
21 any workman, shall furnish to the Board, from time to  
22 time, without additional charge, such reports as may  
23 be required by the Board in respect of such workman.  
24 Some difficulty has been encountered in actions  
25 brought by the City in the name of a workman in  
26 obtaining proper medical reports. It is suggested that  
27 S.52 be amended to make such section applicable to  
28 employers individually liable to pay compensation who  
29 are subrogated to the rights of a workman under S.9  
30 (3) of the Act.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2909

1           9. It is submitted that a new provision  
2       should be inserted in the Act to the effect that any  
3       workman in receipt of benefits under the Act be required  
4       to render such reasonable assistance as may be required  
5       by an employer subrogated to the rights of the workman  
6       under S.9 (3) of the Act, with the proviso that the  
7       workman should not be put to any expense by reason of  
8       such assistance.

9                           All of which is respectfully  
10                          submitted.

11                         W.R. CALLOW, Q.C.,  
12                         City Solicitor.

13       With the exception of the railway brief referred to  
14       this morning, I think that is the only treatment we  
15       have of the third party section, sir.

16       I might once again ask if anyone present  
17       has any matter now to bring before the Royal  
18       Commission.

19                         THE COMMISSIONER: If there is nothing  
20       further, we will adjourn until ten a.m. tomorrow morning.

21  
22       ---Whereupon the Commission adjourned until tomorrow at  
23       ten o'clock a.m.

24  
25  
26  
27       Page 2911 follows.  
28  
29  
30





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2911

Oct. 29/66

1/BL/SS

1 ---On commencing at ten o'clock a.m.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Draper of the Workmen's Compensation Board was asked to prepare for submission certain statistics relating to accident prevention, and I believe that he has those available now and would like to proceed with that matter. Mr. Draper.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

MR. DRAPER: Mr. Commissioner, at your request the Board has been able to update certain of the tables contained in the report of the Labour Safety Council to the Honourable H. L. Rowntree, Minister of Labour, dated January, 1965. Those reports we have been able to update, sir, we submit for your consideration.

16

17

THE COMMISSIONER: You might just enumerate them, please.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

MR. DRAPER: Fine, sir. They are those charts shown on page 11, page 12, and page 18. Unfortunately, we were unable to determine the base used in the construction of the charts on pages 16 and 17, and as a result we have been unable to bring those up to date. I might add, sir, that the charts contained in this report were not originally compiled by the staff of the Board, although certain statistics made available to the Labour Safety Council by the Board were incorporated therein.

28

29

THE COMMISSIONER: You might put those in as exhibits, please.

30

THE SECRETARY: 49, 50, 51.





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2912

---EXHIBIT NO. 49:

Reports of Construction  
Safety Association and  
Industrial Accident Prevention  
Association.

---EXHIBIT NO. 50:

## Report on Grants to Prevention Associations.

---EXHIBIT NO. 51:

Report for 1966 on FPAPA,  
OPPMSA, LAPA, TSA,  
CSAEUSA, MAPA.

MR. DRAPER: STATISTICAL AND INFORMATION SERVICES TO THE SAFETY ASSOCIATIONS

## DEVELOPING SERVICES

Prior to the introduction of data processing equipment at the Board, the information and statistics provided to the Associations consisted largely of copies of the Board forms and the tables and data contained in the Board's Annual Report. Because statistical evaluation of a year's operation could not commence until all data for that year was in there were lengthy delays in providing significant data.

In recent years with the introduction of computers the volume and value of data supplied to the Associations has increased and the delay in producing the Annual Report has been reduced.

The most significant development in the past two years has been the development of the Section 86 (6a) program. Through this program and its related data processing procedures the Associations are now provided with useful, valid information concerning





Nethercut & Young

2913

Toronto, Ontario

1 employers whose accident cost and frequency are above  
2 average. This pinpoints the firms on whom the  
3 Associations must concentrate their efforts for accident  
4 prevention and safety education programs.

5 DATA PROVIDED

7 Data is provided to the Associations as soon  
8 as it is available. This information may be on a daily,  
9 weekly, monthly or yearly basis, depending on the  
10 availability to the Board of the original material.

11 DAILY INFORMATION

13 Each working day the Associations are  
14 provided with:

15 (1) Copies of all claim summary sheets  
16 concerning compensation cases approved  
17 the previous day. Summaries contain  
18 firm number, rate number, claim number,  
19 employer and workman's name and address,  
20 accident date and a brief history of  
21 accident and injury. This data is a  
22 by-product of the initial payment to the  
23 workman.

24 (2) A copy of the Board's initial information  
25 on each new fatal accident is usually  
26 supplied as soon as the Board receives  
27 the information.

28 WEEKLY INFORMATION

29 Data concerning employers is collected and  
30





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2914

1 supplied to the Associations on a weekly basis as  
2 follows:

- 3 (1) A copy of the initial information  
4 concerning each new employer coming  
5 under the Act.
- 6 (2) Correction cards for existing employer  
7 records showing changes in name, address  
8 or ownership.
- 9 (3) Details of employers discontinuing  
10 operations.

11 MONTHLY INFORMATION

12  
13 Each month the Associations are sent a  
14 copy of the Monthly Accident Cost Statement concerning  
15 employers in their classes of industry. These state-  
16 ments list payments for benefits by firm and by claim  
17 within the firm. The statement also shows month and  
18 year to date totals by employer. Some of the  
19 Associations relate these figures to their copies of  
20 the claims summaries.

21 YEARLY INFORMATION

22  
23 Certain reports are available on a yearly  
24 basis and are completed when all the related data is  
25 available. Copies are sent to the Associations of the  
26 following yearly reports:

- 27 (1) Breakdown of Accident Cost by Rate Number.  
28 (2) Provisional Frequency Rates by Firm and  
29 Rate Number.  
30 (3) Final Frequency Rates by Firm and Rate





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2915

- 1 Number.
- 2 (4) Listing of Receipts and Costs by Firm
- 3 Number Within Rate Number, showing
- 4 (a) lifetime experience
- 5 (b) individual years experience over
- 6 past five years
- 7 (5) Listing of Firms Eligible for Increased
- 8 Assessments Under Section 86 (6a) by Firm
- 9 Within Rate Number, showing
- 10 (a) lifetime receipts and costs
- 11 (b) receipts and costs in each of past
- 12 three years
- 13 (c) payroll in each of past three years
- 14 (d) number of compensation cases in each
- 15 of past three years
- 16 (e) firm frequency rate in each of past
- 17 three years
- 18 (f) rate number frequency in each of
- 19 past three years
- 20 (g) name and address of firm.

21 SPECIAL INFORMATION FOR INDIVIDUAL ASSOCIATIONS

22

23 Several Associations have requested special

24 yearly reports. These are supplied as follows:

25 TRANSPORTATION SAFETY ASSOCIATION

26 Breakdown of Accident Cost by rate number

27 for Class 20 - i.e. deferred awards, compensation,

28 capitalized values, medical aid, payroll, receipts,

29 rehabilitation.





Nethercut & Young

2916

Toronto, Ontario

## INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENT PREVENTION ASSOCIATIONS

- (a) Statement by rate number showing receipts, accident cost, and an indication of the rate numbers experiencing a loss in residual balance.

THE COMMISSIONER: What do you mean by "residual balance"?

MR. DRAPER: The balance that remains from previous years in the rate number.

- (b) Average rate of assessment - I. A. P. A.  
- Schedule I

FOREST PRODUCTS ACCIDENT PREVENTION ASSOCIATION

- (a) Statement of experience rating adjustments by firm number within rate number.
  - (b) Statement of receipts, accident cost, etc., required for Forest Products Accident Prevention Association Annual Report.

MINES ACCIDENT PREVENTION ASSOCIATION

Count of firms in Class 5 by rate number.

## ALL ASSOCIATIONS

All Associations receive assessment rates immediately they are approved by the Board.

## COMPUTER OPERATIONS

Virtually all data supplied to the  
Associations is produced through the Board's computer  
operations. Computer output is governed primarily by





Nethercut & Young

2917

Toronto, Ontario

1 two factors, input and the type of computer involved.

2  
3 OUTPUT

4 Output information from the computer can  
5 only be provided on the basis of input taken from  
6 information supplied to the Board by the Association  
7 members, the employers of Ontario. This information  
8 comes from two sources, primarily accident reports and  
9 payroll statements.

10 Accidents must be reported to the Board  
11 within three days of the happening and are generally  
12 completed by bookkeepers, first aid attendants or job  
13 foremen. They contain basically the data required by  
14 the Board for determining entitlement. They do not  
15 contain all of the detail concerning an accident which  
16 might be necessary from an accident prevention  
17 standpoint.

18 Payroll statements are made annually and  
19 contain only that data which is required by the Board  
20 for assessment purposes. If additional data were  
21 required by the Board to satisfy the needs of the  
22 Associations it could only be achieved by expanding our  
23 requirements of the employers. For an employer to  
24 assume the task of collecting data for the Board on each  
25 of his operations would involve additional expense and  
26 time.

27 TYPE OF COMPUTER

28 The Board's existing data processing  
29 operations utilize sequential records on magnetic tape.  
30





1           With this type of record in which all names  
2 and addresses are on one set of tapes, all assessment  
3 records on another set, and such records are sequential,  
4 mass processing on a sequential basis is the only  
5 practical approach. For this reason data is accumulated  
6 for weekly, monthly, or yearly runs so that the maximum  
7 number of records may be updated in each operation.  
8 Similarly, each separate operate requires an individual  
9 program and an individual pass through the computer  
10 to prepare the data for the next operation. From this  
11 it may be seen that it is not practical to run several  
12 long programs through the computer to extract data  
13 concerning an individual firm's experience or record  
14 since it would take the same amount of time as the  
15 regular run for all firms.

16           Computer operating time is already fully  
17 scheduled and overtime is also scheduled. This is  
18 done to ensure that we may continue to perform our  
19 major function, which is the payment of compensation  
20 to injured workmen, without delay.

21           COMPUTER OPERATIONS

22           New types of computers are now being  
23 developed which permit a different approach to data  
24 processing. The Board is already converting to the new  
25 equipment and our information handling programs are  
26 being completely redesigned to take full advantage of  
27 the new methods. This is a long-term proposition and  
28 many man-years of programming are required.

29           The final stage of conversion will be in  
30





Nethercut & Young

2919

Toronto, Ontario

1 1969 when large-scale computers will be delivered and put  
2 into operation. Unlike present equipment which requires  
3 sequential handling and separate programs, the new  
4 equipment will be randomly accessible and has huge  
5 storage capacity so that access is possible to many  
6 different kind of records simultaneously. This will  
7 enable the Board to keep all records current and produce  
8 up-to-date reports on a program interrupt basis. This  
9 means that inquiries may be made on the computer  
10 concerning data in storage, while the machine is doing  
11 other work, without manual intervention. Thus, many  
12 aspects of our present information service now given on  
13 a monthly or annual basis will be available much more  
14 frequently.

15 INFORMATION SERVICE PLANNING

16 Computer equipment is expensive and must  
17 be operated in a responsible manner. The Board, in  
18 planning for its new computer operations, must assess,  
19 in addition to its own requirements, the needs of the  
20 associations for various kinds of data and must  
21 determine which needs are common to all associations  
22 and which must be catered for on an individual basis.

23 Each of the associations and the Department  
24 of Labour have been asked to determine their statistical  
25 and information requirements for the future. Their  
26 requests are many and varied. Some of the requests  
27 are for detailed items such as actual man-hours worked  
28 on each of an employer's operations. Some are general  
29 such as a request for a basis for measuring success of





Nethercut & Young

2920

Toronto, Ontario

1 the safety education effort.

2 All of these requests must be analyzed and  
3 related to present and future capacity to determine which  
4 we can satisfy from present information output, which  
5 justify asking employers to provide new types of infor-  
6 mation and which would not contribute sufficient value  
7 in safety education programs to warrant the cost  
8 involved. At present authority does not exist under  
9 which the Board could require employers to report such  
10 data.

11 Some of the requests, such as that for  
12 exact details of man-hours worked, would require all the  
13 employers in the province to maintain additional records  
14 and make frequent reports to the Board. The Board must  
15 evaluate such request against existing methods. In this  
16 instance the Board presently calculates man-hours worked  
17 using existing financial information from employers and  
18 other data from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

19 PRESENT PLANS

20 Our present plans are based on the concept  
21 that computer programs can be designed to provide advance  
22 indications of those employers requiring remedial action,  
23 and that subsequent reevaluation will indicate the extent  
24 of an improvement which has taken place. The Section 86  
25 (6a) program and listings are based on this principle.

26 We are studying with the Associations  
27 other bench marks which could be established in  
28 identifying those employers whose safety education  
29 programs have deteriorated to the point where assistance  
30





Nethercut & Young

2921

Toronto, Ontario

1 from the Associations is necessary.

2 The Labour Safety Council of Ontario has  
3 recently made a grant to the University of Waterloo to  
4 conduct an independent analysis of the statistical  
5 requirements of all the organizations involved. The  
6 results of this study will be of value to the Board  
7 in assessing its future programs and the philosophy on  
8 which they are based

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





Nethercut &amp; Young

Toronto, Ontario

1 THE COMMISSIONER: The Labour Safety Council  
2 has recently made a grant to the University of Waterloo  
3 to conduct an analysis of statistical requirements. Are  
4 these industrial safety associations alone?

5 MR. DRAPER: No, sir, it is my understanding  
6 that the base on which this analysis is being made is  
7 to determine the requirements of the Department of  
8 Labour in its construction safety branch and industrial  
9 safety branch and other branches which may require this  
10 type of statistical information, the Compensation Board  
11 and the seven accident prevention associations of Ontario  
12 and they will be looking into the requirements of all  
13 of those units.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Including the safety  
15 associations?

16 MR. DRAPER: Yes, sir.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Following the report in  
18 1965 which you refer to as the Labour Safety Council in  
19 which there were certain recommendations made regarding  
20 further statistical information has there in this  
21 tabulated list you have given us the information that  
22 has now been given of the associations any noticeable  
23 change since that time? Are they getting more  
24 information than they were?

25 MR. DRAPER: Yes, sir, in one case --

26 THE COMMISSIONER: I ask this question  
27 knowing that you have in process this business of trying  
28 to improve and to decide what is vital and what isn't and  
29 what you can ask for and what you can't. But since that  
30 time in January, 1965, when this report came out, it is





Nethercut & Young

2923

Toronto, Ontario

1 not so long ago, have you been able to institute any  
2 changes as yet?

3 MR. DRAPER: Yes, sir, there is one byproduct  
4 that is coming out that is of great use to the safety  
5 associations and that is referred to in the submission.  
6 As the listing of firms eligible for increased assessment  
7 under Section 86 (6a) and you may recall that there was  
8 considerable information supplied in that. Now, this  
9 program is supplied to each of the safety associations  
10 and covers those firms within its jurisdiction who are  
11 in the 86 (6a) area. These are the firms that are  
12 in trouble for one reason or another and it is therefore  
13 an indication to the safety associations that this is a  
14 good place to start on their educational work, that  
15 these are the firms that need it more than the general  
16 population. So this has come out since January, 1965.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: And how fast are you  
18 able to process that information and get it to them  
19 when you realize a company is in danger?

20 MR. DRAPER: This information was given to  
21 the safety associations last month and the information  
22 contained in the report covers the calendar years 1965,  
23 1964 and 1963 for those firms who are in an 86 (6a)  
24 condition.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: There is not as yet any  
26 program of notifying them week by week or month by month  
27 of firms that are in this danger area?

28 MR. DRAPER: No, sir, there is not at  
29 present. This is one of the things that we have been  
30 considering. The problem as we now face it with the





1 equipment we have and with the information we have in the  
2 equipment providing the base against which a comparison  
3 can be made is one of extracting it promptly when a firm  
4 reaches a dangerous position and it has been suggested  
5 that our statistical program for safety education could  
6 be modified so that the computer could be programmed  
7 to indicate when a firm reached a predetermined danger  
8 point in its accident history. For example, it might  
9 be when their costs for this year pass their equivalent  
10 costs for the same period last year by 25 percent, when  
11 they have two fatalities, or in the case of a larger  
12 firm, when they have five accidents in one week. These  
13 bench marks could be established and incorporated into  
14 the computer so that as claims are entered, the details  
15 of the claims are entered into the computer a warning  
16 would come from the computer indicating that this firm  
17 has now passed with the addition of this last claim its  
18 predetermined danger point. This would then serve as an  
19 indication which could be passed to the associations that  
20 this firm has hit this danger point and a personal  
21 investigation is now a requirement. The computer would  
22 not indicate why it had spelled this out ---

23 THE COMMISSIONER: A kind of red light, in  
24 other words?

25 MR. DRAPER: That is correct, sir.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: And how frequently would  
27 that go? Would that go to them every time the red light  
28 appeared? Not necessarily at regular intervals?

29 MR. DRAPER: We anticipate that such a  
30 warning could be given within two weeks of the





Nethercut & Young

2925

Toronto, Ontario

1 information being fed into the machine which means that  
2 if firm A have been continuing this for this year and  
3 had a claim entered today that tilted them in the  
4 dangerous direction that within two weeks of today's  
5 date the associations would be so advised that on  
6 November 29th this firm hit the danger point.

7 Then I would imagine the procedure would  
8 be for the management counsellor or the field man from  
9 the association to refer to the Board why is this firm  
10 now in trouble?

11 THE COMMISSIONER: That is one of the  
12 things I intended to ask you. When you get a situation  
13 where you are going to impose the penalties under 86 (6a)  
14 does the Board then work with the particular association  
15 in connection with that particular company? What  
16 occurs then when you get that, apart from notifying the  
17 company you are going to put the penalty on, or do you  
18 do something before you put the penalty on?

19 MR. DRAPER: At present, sir, those  
20 companies who are liable for an 86 (6a) assessment this  
21 year may not yet have been notified but the associations  
22 are already aware that these companies are in this  
23 position. In the case of the second offence where a  
24 company may be coming up for the second time for  
25 consideration of 86 (6a) the safety associations are  
26 asked to submit a report on that company's safety  
27 program to the Board for consideration before the  
28 notice of assessment goes out. But in the case of the  
29 first offence they would be requested to submit a  
30 report on the safety program of that company should the





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2926

1 company appeal the assessment.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: I understand from you  
3 that you have requested from what you have said in this  
4 memorandum that requests were made to the safety departments  
5 and the Department of Labour and to your own associations  
6 for what statistical information they required or  
7 thought they required in connection with their safety  
8 programs.

9 MR. DRAPER: That is correct, sir.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: And that the demands  
11 are apparently sufficiently wide and involved to  
12 justify this inquiry by the Labour Council.

13 MR. DRAPER: I think this is a true state-  
14 ment, sir. They are varied. The problem is one of  
15 providing the basic information into the machine. It is  
16 physically possible to do everything that is requested  
17 by everyone, but not within the abilities of the  
18 equipment the Board presently has or anticipates  
19 receiving, but on the broad basis you can compute  
20 anything. It then became a requirement of determining  
21 where does the law of diminishing returns come into  
22 this? You can spend only so much money on computer  
23 equipment to provide a service from which you will get  
24 significant results and our problem has been to  
25 determine how much of this information is a requirement.  
26 Once we have determined how much is a requirement, we  
27 have to secure the basic information and the only place  
28 this can come from in our estimation is the employer of  
29 Ontario.

30 We would have to ask him for a terrific





Toronto, Ontario

amount of statistical background from his firm to provide the base and give all of the information required. We have neither the authority to do that at this point, to demand that he provide this information and it is doubtful whether a request for this information would be well received as he would have to engage a considerable staff in order to provide the breakdown. This has been the problem that has faced my department within the Board. How could we provide this statistical information and is it going to do any good or really in the area of safety education and accident prevention really is not a requirement for that one facet and that facet only that of knowing when a firm reaches a danger point so that you can concentrate on that firm.

THE COMMISSIONER: In other words, you are going to inquire into the possibility of demanding from the various industries all this additional information that some of the associations and others have requested and then you are going to inquire into the possibility of processing it and then you are going to consider whether actually all of this was necessary in view of this other red light that you are able to flash under your present operating system or under the system which is now going into effect, am I correct? Am I stating that correctly?

MR. DRAPER: Yes, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think, Mr. Draper, that that satisfies the questions I have in mind. I don't know what Mr. Guthrie has.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2928

1                   MR. GUTHRIE: Just one or two things, Mr.  
2 Draper. On this question of authority, I am looking at  
3 Section 115 of the Act which seems to be the one under  
4 which you can require a report and after listing the  
5 specific items that the employer must include in his  
6 report then it goes on to say: "And shall in any case  
7 furnish such further details and particulars respecting  
8 any accident or claim to compensation as the Board may  
9 require", that is the employer shall.

10                  I am just wondering if you are suggesting  
11 here in your memorandum that some broadening of that  
12 would help the Board or do you think that is enough as  
13 it is?

14                  MR. DRAPER: I think that applies to  
15 information that the Board can't request, seek or demand  
16 after an accident and relates to that accident. Our  
17 concern is not the amount of information that we can  
18 secure concerning any individual accident, there is no  
19 problem there at all, but the problem is to provide the  
20 base of information in advance of any accident so that  
21 we have some basic statistics against which we can  
22 compare any individual cases to see whether there is a  
23 trend.

24                  MR. GUTHRIE: The information of a more  
25 general nature, man-hours worked, for example?

26                  MR. DRAPER: That is right. If we had to  
27 determine the man-hours worked using power tools, for  
28 instance, this information would have to come from the  
29 employers and in order to provide a basis for this we  
30 should know the man-hours worked in the province in any





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2929

1 one year or a period of time using power tools so that  
2 accidents involving power tools could be compared to the  
3 total population and maybe only have three accident in  
4 two or three million man-hours on that project, but in  
5 order to be able to determine the statistical significance  
6 of the occurrence of these accidents we must have a broad  
7 base. We don't have the authority to get the broad base.

8 MR.GUTHRIE: Are you suggesting to this  
9 Commission that that authority would be a desirable  
10 thing at this time?

11 MR. DRAPER: No, sir, I am not.

12 MR.GUTHRIE: On the first page of your  
13 memorandum the first item that you provide on a daily  
14 basis to the associations is a copy of the claims  
15 summary sheet. Is this sort of a file cover idea?

16 MR. DRAPER: This is our form 25-A. It  
17 gives basic information to the associations on an  
18 accident as it is being reported.

19 MR. GUTHRIE: Who prepares it, the Claims  
20 Officer?

21 MR. DRAPER: It is prepared in the Claims  
22 Department, yes, but not by the Claims Officer. It is  
23 a summary of the information contained on the form 7  
24 report of the accident.

25 MR. GUTHRIE: Does it include medical  
26 matters, or is it just the name and date?

27 MR. DRAPER: As stated here, the firm,  
28 rate number, claim number, employer, workman's name and  
29 address and the date, history of the accident and  
30 a brief description.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2930

1                   MR. GUTHRIE: With a view to flagging for  
2 the associations anything that is of concern to the  
3 Board about a particular accident, does the person who  
4 prepares that summary have to write any comment, or is it  
5 purely factual? Does he ever say "this should be followed  
6 up, we have had a lot of these"?

7                   MR. DRAPER: Very seldom.

8                   MR. GUTHRIE: The Board does not comment on  
9 these, it would seem.

10                  MR. DRAPER: No.

11                  MR. GUTHRIE: Thank you, Mr. Draper.

12                  Mr. Commissioner, I think Mr. Gibson of the  
13 Department of Labour has a brief comment to make on this  
14 same point and we might follow on with him at this time.

15                  MR. GIBSON: Mr. Commissioner, the purpose  
16 of my appearance here this morning is to emphasize that  
17 the Department of Labour needs accident statistics to  
18 do its work. They play an important part in the  
19 prevention of accidents, chiefly because the facts of no  
20 one individual accident or of those relating to small  
21 groups of accidents can properly be held to represent a  
22 general province-wide or even an industry-wide situation.  
23 Mass data, when properly collected and analyzed can  
24 indicate trouble spots which need more emphasis or  
25 different approaches. It can supply information for an  
26 overall administrative review and can permit a measure of  
27 present and past performance comparison.

28                  The Workmen's Compensation Board has in the  
29 past produced [redacted] to these statistics on an annual basis.  
30 These were not released until much later the following





Nethercut & Young

2931

Toronto, Ontario

1 year and retained historical value only for the  
2 Department of Labour. The directors of our Industrial  
3 and Construction Safety Branches require that as much  
4 statistical information as possible be released monthly.  
5 Although monthly data may not be as extensive and  
6 complete as an annual report, it should be stressed that  
7 some measure of performance and evidence of accident  
8 characteristics should be available as quickly as  
9 possible for each month.

10 Under the Trench Excavators Protection Act  
11 the employers are obliged to report their accidents to  
12 the chief officer, that is Section 22 (a) of that Act.  
13 That program started the 1st of January, 1966. Under  
14 Section 19 (b) of the Construction Safety Act employers  
15 are similarly obliged to report accidents causing loss  
16 of time of three days or more. Under Section 48 of  
17 Ontario Regulation 1-6 of 1964 under the Industrial  
18 Safety Act employers are obliged to submit accident  
19 reports to the Chief Inspector.

when

20 It is our desire that /an accident report  
21 made out by an employer that goes to the Workmen's  
22 Compensation Board, that the same information  
23 simultaneously come to us either as it does now through  
24 a copy of that report being sent or from the Board to us.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: At the moment you get a  
26 copy of all accident reports to the Board, do you?

27 MR. GIBSON: The employer sends it to us.  
28 He can send us a carbon copy of form 7 which we accept.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: What are you requesting,  
30 then, in addition to that?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2932

1                   MR. GIBSON: If possible, that only one  
2 report by the employer be necessary, that he send it to  
3 the Board and that the information then come to us. It  
4 is in an effort to streamline reporting.

5                   THE COMMISSIONER: It means the employer  
6 doesn't have to make out a carbon copy, but it means  
7 that you have to have two reports. The report goes to  
8 the Board and the Board has to report to you.

9                   MR. GIBSON: That is right, yes.

10                  THE COMMISSIONER: Do you think that would  
11 be an improvement?

12                  MR. GIBSON: Employers, I think as a whole  
13 sometimes forget to make the carbon for one thing, and  
14 if we could be sure ---- more accidents are reported to  
15 the Board than to us, we are sure of that; in other  
16 words, there are cases where employers are failing to  
17 report to us.

18                  THE COMMISSIONER: But you would ask the  
19 Board to send you the individual reports?

20                  MR. GIBSON: If we could get it, yes.

21                  The present method seemed to be the most  
22 direct way of doing it if we got every report.

23                  The retention of the University of Waterloo  
24 people is a later development. We put all the  
25 questions to the Workmen's Compensation Board last spring  
26 and it is only recently that this arrangement has been  
27 made with the University of Waterloo and it will have an  
28 effect on what we will end up with which we formerly  
29 requested. We need statistics to do our work and we need  
30 more than we are getting now.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2933

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, the more you get no  
2 doubt the better, but it is also a question of how much  
3 you can ask industry to supply, I suppose you are aware  
4 of that too.

5 MR. GIBSON: Yes. It is in the area of man-  
6 hours worked which I think is the biggest single problem.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: If a man is working at  
8 the top of the Toronto-Dominion Bank it might be hard to  
9 know whether he is using a power saw or how many man-  
10 hours he is putting in on that and on something else.

11 MR. GIBSON: Yes, it is carrying it to the  
12 nth degree. It might not be necessary, that fine a  
13 breakdown.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Have you any questions,  
15 Mr. Guthrie?

16 MR. GUTHRIE: No, I have no questions.

17 Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Culliton and his  
18 colleagues of the International Railway Brotherhoods  
19 are with us this morning and would like to address the  
20 Commission.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know what progress  
22 we are going to make today. We sat yesterday for the  
23 hearing of any submissions in reply, but did not have  
24 many people turn up yesterday. As a consequence, we  
25 had a very short morning, but we had previously made  
26 arrangements for the present representations to be made  
27 through some errors that occurred. They did not receive  
28 notice when others received notice of the hearings that  
29 were being held. As a consequence, we will have to  
30 proceed now with these submissions, which are submissions





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2034

1 on all points and if time is available we can then hear  
2 submissions in reply from those who are here for that  
3 purpose.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





Nethercut & Young

2935

Toronto, Ontario

- L/SS 1 What is your name, please?
- 2 MR. CULLITON: F. J. Culliton.
- 3 MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Culliton, would you like
- 4 to introduce the other gentlemen who are with you.
- 5 MR. CULLITON: On my far left is Mr. J. A.
- 6 Devlin of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees;
- 7 Mr. R. F. Hounsome of the Brotherhood of Locomotive
- 8 Engineers; Mr. Joe Martindale of the Brotherhood of
- 9 Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.
- 10 TO: The Honourable George Argo McGillivray
- 11 Your Lordship:
- 12 This joint committee representing the
- 13 following International Railway Organizations in the
- 14 Province of Ontario,
- 15 Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen
- 16 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers
- 17 Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees
- 18 Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and
- 19 Enginemen
- 20 Transportation - Communication Employees
- 21 Union
- 22 appreciates the opportunity of appearing before this
- 23 Commission of Inquiry into the Workmen's Compensation
- 24 Act.
- 25 The representations we have been making
- 26 to the Government, and which we now wish to place before
- 27 you with supporting arguments, have been carefully
- 28 drafted, to cover problems encountered when progressing
- 29 benefit claims for the employees we have the honour to
- 30 represent.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2936

1            We wish to state at the outset that our  
2 committee enjoys a very harmonious relationship with  
3 officers and staff of the Ontario Workmen's Compensation  
4 Board, who are responsible for administering the Act, in  
5 providing due and just compensation to those who are  
6 disabled as a result of an accident or industrial  
7 disease during the course of their employment.

8            We respectfully submit for your considera-  
9 tion the following proposed amendments to the Ontario  
10 Workmen's Compensation Act. In doing so, we recognize that  
11 the principle on which the Act is based extends to the  
12 workman protection for all accidents arising out of and  
13 in the course of the employment; it places the  
14 adjudication of claims in the hands of the Workmen's  
15 Compensation Board; and in most of the industries to  
16 which it applies, makes the employer's liability collec-  
17 tive instead of individual.

18 WAITING PERIOD

19            We recommend that Section 3, Subsection (1)  
20 (a) be amended to read as follows:

21            "If the injury does not disable the  
22 workman longer than the day of the  
23 accident, no compensation other  
24 than medical aid shall be paid, but  
25 if injury disables the workman longer  
26 than the day of the accident compensation  
27 shall be payable from and including  
28 the day following the accident."

29            This proposed amendment of the waiting  
30





Nethercut & Young

2937

Toronto, Ontario

1 period to one day is in line with Workmen's Compensation  
2 Acts now in effect in Alberta, Manitoba, Newfoundland,  
3 Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan.

4 If I may make a comment, I noticed in the  
5 newspapers it is in the Northwest Territories, too, just  
6 the other day.

7 At present when an employee is injured  
8 causing disablement for three days or less the workman  
9 is entitled to medical treatment but without compensa-  
10 tion. When the disablement is for four days or more  
11 Workmen's Compensation benefits are available to the  
12 claimant. Since the purpose of the Act is to compensate  
13 the injured workman for loss of earnings, we contend  
14 there is no valid reason why the injured workman should  
15 wait longer than one day to qualify for compensation.  
16 Under the proposed amendment compensation will not be  
17 payable for disability that lasts for one day.  
18 However, if the disability lasts for a longer period,  
19 compensation shall be paid from and including the date  
20 after the accident.

21 During the recent hearings held before the  
22 Honourable Mr. Justice Charles W. Tysoe, into the  
23 inquiry of the British Columbia Workmen's Compensation  
24 Act, Mr. Sigler, counsel for the Board, stated:

25 "The position of the Workmen's  
26 Compensation Board is that careful  
27 consideration be given to the elimi-  
28 nation of the waiting period to elimi-  
29 nate the present period of three days,  
30 so that, administratively, the work





Nethercut & Young

2938

Toronto, Ontario

1 would be made easier for the Board and be  
2 no more costly in the opinion of the Board.<sup>??</sup>

3 We are of the opinion that this proposed  
4 amendment would not be an administrative problem and  
5 would speed up the handling of claims by avoiding many  
6 enquiries and thus would reduce overall costs.

7 BURIAL EXPENSES

8  
9 Section 37, Subsection (1) (a). We  
10 recommend recommend that the necessary expenses of the  
11 burial of the workman not exceed \$700.00, and in  
12 addition an allowance for the actual cost of the burial  
13 plot.

14 A survey indicates that the average cost  
15 of burial is increasing and the present allowance does  
16 not meet the cost of an appropriate burial. We suggest  
17 consideration be given to provide a like suitable  
18 allowance for burial of the widow as many widows who  
19 have worked to raise their families do not leave  
20 sufficient resources to provide for their burial.

21 PAYMENT TO WIDOW OR INVALID HUSBAND

22  
23 Section 37, Subsection (1) (c). We  
24 recommend this section be amended to provide a monthly  
25 payment of \$125.00.

26 We believe this to be an equitable amount  
27 in view of increased living costs.

28 PAYMENTS FOR CHILDREN OF DECEASED WORKMEN

29  
30 Amend Section 37 to provide a payment of





Nethercut & Young

2939

Toronto, Ontario

1        \$60.00 per month to dependent children and \$75.00 per  
2        month to orphan children and where there are three or  
3        more dependents or orphan dependents the payments on the  
4        whole should be increased accordingly.

5           I could make a comment at this time. We  
6        feel that the payments should be based on the relationship  
7        to a man's earnings. If he is hurt the family's standard  
8        of living will be lower. This is why we ask for the  
9        increase.

10      SECTION - I - COMPENSABILITY

11           A workman is on a payroll and employed  
12        at the time of his accident, otherwise he would have  
13        entitlement to benefits under the Act. The injuries  
14        resulting from the accident have taken him completely  
15        outside the labour force and it is our contention that  
16        he should be entitled to full compensation payments  
17        until he is returned to employment. Too frequently a  
18        doctor reports an injured workman as fit for "light  
19        work" and on receipt of such a report compensation  
20        payments are immediately reduced. The healing period and  
21        the disability have not matured, the man is unable to  
22        resume his usual employment or to find employment for  
23        which he is fit. No employment is offered by the  
24        employer in whose service the disability occurred. This  
25        man, still incapacitated and unemployed, is thrown onto  
26        the labour market on his own impaired resources, but with  
27        50 percent or 25 percent of benefits being paid.

28           We submit that the principle of Workmen's  
29        Compensation intends that compensation be paid while the  
30        disability lasts, which should be continued until such





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2940

1 time as he is able to resume his usual occupation.

2 In keeping with that principle, no such  
3 reduction in temporary disability payments as above  
4 described should be permitted.

5 WAGE CEILING ON WHICH COMPENSATION IS PAID

6  
7 Section 44, and all other relevant sections.

8 We believe that the wage ceiling on earnings which is  
9 considered in the computation of benefits should be  
10 abolished so as to include the yearly earnings of all  
11 workmen. No compensation is payable on earnings in  
12 excess of \$6,000.00. This limitation decreases the  
13 percentage of compensation and increases the wage loss  
14 for workmen earning in excess of that amount. There is  
15 no justification for denying equitable compensation to  
16 the injured workman whose average annual earnings  
17 exceed \$6,000.00.

18 EXAMPLE (presently in effect).

21	Annual Earnings	Allowed Percentage	Compen- sation Allowed	Actual Wage Loss	Actual Percentage of Earnings
22	\$6,000	75%	\$4,500	\$1,500	75%
23	\$6,500	75%	\$4,500	\$2,000	69.24%
24	\$7,000	75%	\$4,500	\$2,500	64.40%
25	\$7,500	75%	\$4,500	\$3,000	60.01%
26	\$8,000	75%	\$4,500	\$3,500	56.25%
27					
28					
29					
30					





Nethercut & Young

2941

Toronto, Ontario

1 As the earnings go up the percentage goes  
2 down.

3 One of the fundamentals enunciated by Sir  
4 William Meredith was that during periods of disability  
5 a workman should receive a percentage of his earnings.  
6 When Sir William made his report in 1914, stating an  
7 annual salary limit of \$2,000.00, he did so to differen-  
8 tiate between the employer and the work people. Bear in  
9 mind that most employers in those days were persons  
10 actually directing company policy and were in the main  
11 entrepreneurs. Bear in mind also that the wage rate for  
12 skilled machinists at that time, as an illustration, was  
13 approximately eleven cents per hour.

14 It is our contention that workmen during  
15 periods of total temporary compensable disability  
16 should receive a minimum of 80% of actual earnings.  
17 Because so many work people earn in excess of \$6,000.00  
18 per year, at the present time their compensation payments  
19 are, in essence, only forty, fifty or possibly fifty-five  
20 percent of earnings.

21 The Act, and Board responsible for its  
22 administration, are the sole means for the protection of  
23 the injured workman in lieu of all common law rights.

24 That factor was a basic principle upon  
25 which the Act was originally founded and it has  
26 survived the test of time despite frequent proposals of  
27 various forms of review that would require litigation,  
28 contrary to the original and confirmed principles of the  
29 Act. Our experience with the Board for many years has  
30 indicated a desire to deal fairly, firmly and promptly





Nethercut & Young

2942

Toronto, Ontario

1 in the adjudication of claims.

2 We are mindful of the prompt relief that  
3 can be and should be afforded disabled workers and  
4 dependents by the Board under its authority, but there  
5 is a growing lack of confidence in the Board and  
6 administration due to the recent changes that have been  
7 made.

8 This matter was brought to the floor of the  
9 Legislature of Ontario during the Evening Session of  
10 Monday, June 20, 1966.

11 During the debate mention was made of the  
12 report of the Honourable Justice Tysoe to support the  
13 new appeal system instituted during the past year. It  
14 has been our experience that this new system is delaying  
15 the adjudication of claims, thus depriving the workman  
16 of his right to benefits under the Act, causing an  
17 unnecessary hardship for the man and his family.

18 Mr. Justice Tysoe, in his report stated,  
19 and we quote:

20 "I cannot see the necessity in  
21 British Columbia of both a Board  
22 of Review and an Appeal Tribunal  
23 as in Ontario. My impression is that  
24 the former can perform the functions  
25 of both, and it is my intention that  
26 it should do so."

27 As Mr. Justice Tysoe did not recommend this  
28 appeal system and did support our former procedure of  
29 appeal; and as representatives of our members, we  
30 receive so many complaints of delays and et cetera,





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2943

1 since this new system was instituted, we feel that a  
2 thorough study should be made of the Administration, the  
3 handling of claims, and the new appeal system, to  
4 determine the cost and efficiency of same.

5 If I would be permitted to make a few more  
6 comments on this, Mr. Commissioner.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. We will have some  
8 questions to ask.

9 MR. CULLITON: Although we dealt briefly  
10 in our submission of August, 1966, with the present  
11 system of adjudicating claims and appeals procedure, we  
12 now wish to enlarge on the subject in view of information  
13 that has come to us concerning the overall efficiency of  
14 claims handling procedure introduced by the Board in  
15 March, 1965.

16 It is the position of our Committee that  
17 the present claims handling system is too complicated,  
18 unnecessarily formal and time-consuming. The present  
19 procedure places the worker at a disadvantage in obtaining  
20 just treatment under the Act because of the two  
21 administrative levels which he must go through before  
22 obtaining a hearing at which representation can be made  
23 on his behalf. We suspect that at the first level of  
24 adjudication a claim is often rejected simply because  
25 the Review Committee is there to handle "sticky" cases  
26 and thus responsibility for a fair application of the  
27 Act where the worker gets the benefit of the doubt is  
28 passed along to the Review Committee. The procedure  
29 followed by the Review Committee of investigating  
30 claims without holding hearings and of rendering





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2944

1 decisions without reasons for such decisions creates a  
2 feeling of doubt in the minds of workers concerning the  
3 fairness of the system presently in effect. The next  
4 step in the appeals procedure, the Appeal Tribunal,  
5 creates a courtroom atmosphere where the workman is  
6 referred to as appellant, his union or other  
7 representative as counsel, and where witnesses are sworn  
8 in. All of this suggests a growing bureaucracy within  
9 the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Board, an organization  
10 that two short years ago was the model of efficiency for  
11 all similar organizations the world over. For years  
12 the Ontario Board was the only Board where unions had  
13 direct access to Board members. Now the Ontario Board  
14 is the only one where this situation does not exist.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Isn't that a  
16 contradiction? You said, if I understood you, that the  
17 Ontario Board was the only one where you had direct  
18 access to Board members.

19 MR. CULLITON: Where you do not have  
20 direct access.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: You said you did have  
22 direct access.

23 MR. CULLITION: Yes, up to 1965. We don't  
24 have the direct access that we used to have.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Your first statement  
26 was that you did have it.

27 MR. CULLTON: For years the Ontario  
28 Board was the only Board where unions had direct access.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Have they been  
30 changing?





Nethercut & Young

2945

Toronto, Ontario

1                   MR. CULLITON: They have been changing  
2     all the time. But we are concerned with is the new  
3     system in Ontario where we are running into trouble. I  
4     think British Columbia and Ontario are the only two  
5     Boards now where you don't have direct access; with the  
6     other Boards you do.

7                   THE COMMISSIONER: I am afraid I don't  
8     follow you on that either.

9                   MR. CULLITON: Well, to give you an  
10   illustration or an idea of what we are faced with, as a  
11   union representative, when a claim comes to me that is  
12   turned down --- each lodge has their claim representative  
13   --- a compensation claim will be given to the lodge  
14   member and he processes it, gives the member the  
15   information to process his claim; but if the claim is  
16   denied it is given to the Chairman of the Committee. Now,  
17   we would contact a senior member of the Board and ask  
18   what was wrong with the claim. We don't ask for any  
19   favours, but possibly he will come back and say there is  
20   lack of information. Then we would go back to the  
21   member and he would refill the form and it would go to  
22   the proper place it should have gone to in the first  
23   place. As a result, in a week or ten days the claim  
24   goes through or it goes to the Appeal Board. Now the  
25   claim is turned down and there seems to be a rubber stamp  
26   correspondence where you can appeal this claim. There is  
27   a committee which passes the buck.

28                   THE COMMISSIONER: How many claims did  
29   you have last year, Mr. Kerr?

30                   MR. KERR: Last year we had almost





Nethercutt & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2946

1 360,000 claims, sir, of which approximately 160,000 would  
2 involve the payment of compensation, the others would  
3 involve medical aid claims only involving no compensation.

THE COMMISSIONER: Of the 160,000 how many, can you tell us offhand, were turned down at the claims level before it came to the Board of Review?

MR. KERR: Between 4% and 5% of those claims would be rejected by the Claims Department.

THE COMMISSIONER: 4% or 5% of 160,000.

What is that?

MR. CULLITON: Am I permitted to ask

questions?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, but what is bothering me is how much is this person capable of handling in relation to his other duties. The administration is becoming so great, the claims have become so great that it hasn't been possible to deal with them all in any given time.

MR. KERR: The answer would be approximately 9,000 claims rejected each year of this particular group.

THE COMMISSIONER: The claims coming into the labour member must have been making it impossible for him to carry on when one considers the many other duties there.

MR. CULLITON: Since this last year and a half this is the trouble we have been running into, that with this rubber stamp appeal system everybody is appealing. May I ask Mr. Kerr how many claims are before the Appeal Board now? Why are we getting two and three





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2947

1 and four weeks waiting before we get answers to our  
2 letters?

3 THE COMMISSIONER: If you have cases  
4 of waiting two, three and four weeks before getting  
5 answers, perhaps you could send some examples in to us.

6 MR. CULLITON: They would automatically  
7 appeal, but answers are getting further and further  
8 apart. We didn't have this trouble before 1965. This  
9 is where our dissatisfaction is.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, there is also ---  
11 it might be complicating matters --- a statement made by  
12 one of the unions that they propose to appeal everything.  
13 They don't like the system, so they are going to appeal  
14 every case, and it will jam up the operation.

15 MR. CULLITON: We appeal not to jam up  
16 everything. When we had a claim we could contact these  
17 men at the Department there and get this information,  
18 and this would speed the case up. But we can't do it now.  
19 We have no contact whatsoever with the Board, so it has  
20 to go up those steps and naturally there is going to be  
21 a backlog, and the man on compensation is the one who is  
22 suffering.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you think if you  
24 had some access to the Board of Review you would be  
25 better off?

26 MR. CULLITON: I think if we had a  
27 system that was put in, this extra step, it would be  
28 satisfactory, the old system.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: If you go back to the  
30 old system, you had a claim and it was refused and then





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2948

1 you went to the Board of Review and then you went straight  
2 to the Board. Once again, the work load is becoming so  
3 great that it has to be filtered out and somebody else  
4 has got to do some of the work that was previously done  
5 by the Board. That is what I understand is the case put  
6 up by the Compensation Board.

7 MR. CULLITON: Put it this way: a claim  
8 goes in to the Compensation Board, it goes to the first  
9 committee, Review Committee, and there is lack of  
10 information and it is turned down and they say that you  
11 can go to the Appeal Board, whereas in the old system we  
12 would contact the senior member and they would send back  
13 word saying that there was lack of information on medical  
14 grounds. We were not getting any favours or fixing any  
15 claims, but it prevented a lot of these steps now.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: What you have said  
17 has been said by others; it has been the complaint of  
18 other unions.

19 MR. CULLITON: We found out that it is  
20 the fact. That is why we put this into our brief. We  
21 were not in contact with anybody else; this is our own  
22 committee. So if they say the same it must be universal.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: I can understand how  
24 the complaint arises; but, on the other hand, the  
25 situation here isn't the same, the work load here is  
26 totally different from that in British Columbia, and  
27 this Commission has to decide whether a change is  
28 justified or whether there should be a change.

29 MR. CULLITON: That is what we submit  
30 in our brief. We would like to see a change.





Nethercut & Young

2949

Toronto, Ontario

1                   If I may go through some newspaper  
2 articles, we would bring to your attention and then would  
3 make comment on the Globe & Mail of October 5th, 1966,  
4 to the effect that the Board has asked that a study be  
5 made to see if pensions to persons permanently disabled  
6 should not terminate when workmen go on retirement  
7 pension or become eligible for the Canada Pension Plan.  
8 Now, the railroad man is a peculiar animal, they say, in  
9 one way; we work all hours of the night and everything  
10 else. But in the railway industry industrial accidents  
11 often impede the earning ability of the workman to the  
12 extent that the railway pension plans based on service  
13 and average earnings are reduced. In both the CNR and  
14 CPR pension plans there is provision for a worker to  
15 contribute to the pension plan while off work due to a  
16 compensable injury, thus protecting the worker against  
17 loss of service and the consequent reduction in pension  
18 benefits.

19                   THE COMMISSIONER: Up to the present, as  
20 I understand it, the man was on permanent pension, whether  
21 it be full pension or partial disability pension, and  
22 when they reached the point where he could also get the  
23 railway pension, if that was the case, or whatever other  
24 pension there was, no interference in the past has  
25 occurred, no change has occurred. Once he gets a  
26 permanent disability pension he gets it for good. That  
27 is in the past.

28                   MR. CULLITION: That is right. In that  
29 connection, the only jurisdiction I know that has it is  
30 Saskatchewan where in some circumstances they reduce





Nethercut & Young

2950

Toronto, Ontario

1 the amount when they reach a certain age.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: What about the  
3 Canada Pension Plan which has a disability provision  
4 there? Won't the situation develop where a man will be  
5 making more money off work than he will be at work? It  
6 may be considered that there is no deduction for income  
7 tax and various other things which he would have if he  
8 was working.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2951

FJN/SS 1 MR. CULLITON: There could be a possibility.

2 I have never delved into that, but speaking of the  
3 individual on the railroad who is permanently disabled  
4 he automatically suffers a cut in his earnings because  
5 there are a lot of jobs that he can't do. All during  
6 his life he has been unable to make greater earnings  
7 than he should on account of his disability. So I  
8 don't think it would be fair at the time of, say, 65 in  
9 the latter part of his life that his pension should be  
10 cut off because, after all, you can't buy pain in dollars  
11 and cents.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: That is one of the  
13 things that has been raised before.

14 MR. CULLITON: I hope you take  
15 cognizance of that in your recommendations.

16 Are there any questions you would like  
17 to ask me, Mr. Commissioner?

18 THE COMMISSIONER: No, except this: Do  
19 I understand your submission to be that we should go  
20 back to the old system where there is one appeal to a  
21 Review Board and then the next appeal is to the  
22 Workmen's Compensation Board Commissioners themselves?

23 MR. CULLITON: I would sooner see it  
24 back under the other appeal system. I don't know really  
25 why this new appeal system came into existence. It must  
26 have cost a lot.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: I told you the  
28 explanation that has been given us, that there were just  
29 three Commissioners who were supposed to be running the  
30 Workmen's Compensation Board with a lot of other





Nethercut & Young

2952

Toronto, Ontario

1 important duties such as investment of funds, assessment  
2 of industry and all the other things, who were being  
3 called upon at the same time to sit on the second field  
4 of appeal and without knowing what the exact situation  
5 was it seemed to me that they were in an impossible  
6 position, that they were being called upon to do far more  
7 than they were capable of doing under the old system.

8 MR. CULLITON: They might say they  
9 celebrated their fiftieth anniversary and here it has  
10 been satisfactory to both employers and employees. Now,  
11 all of a sudden this new system comes in and we are  
12 having difficulty with it. It speaks for itself, you  
13 might say.

14 MR. GUTHRIE: I am wondering, Mr.  
15 Culliton, if that would not be really a matter of  
16 unfamiliarity with the system.

17 MR. CULLITON: In which way would it be  
18 unfamiliarity?

19 MR. GUTHRIE: Well, you became used to  
20 doing things in a particular way and you found certain  
21 channels of communication changed. Is it possible that  
22 perhaps the matter of this new procedure just needs a  
23 bit of a shakedown and a little bit of working out, a  
24 test, and in time you could become attuned to it? It  
25 puzzles me when you say that a claim could be rejected  
26 for lack of information, that you couldn't learn of that  
27 until it had gone through to the appeal level. As we  
28 have understood the evidence from the Board, there is a  
29 particular section that deals mainly by telephone with  
30 that very matter --- not just one labour representative,





Nethercut & Young

2953

Toronto, Ontario

1 but a whole battery of people who do nothing but try and  
2 say, "We need more information", answering inquiries,  
3 correcting problems and so forth, but I can't believe  
4 that claims are rejected except because of a disentitlement  
5 ruling.

6 MR. CULLITON: Would you explain what  
7 you call a battery of union representatives?

8 MR. GUTHRIE: I didn't say union  
9 representatives. I said a battery of employees of that  
10 Board whose sole duty, as I understand it, is to answer  
11 inquiries and to assist people to get claims moving and  
12 going.

13 MR. CULLITON: Well, let us go back to  
14 say a year and a half or two years ago --- say six years  
15 since I was elected to this job. My predecessor  
16 introduced me to Mr. Crisp, Mr. Colley and Mr. McClure  
17 and Mr. Farquharson. These were the gentlemen we were  
18 to deal with in any claims for the Brotherhood of  
19 Railway Trainmen. I have no contact today with these  
20 fellows. There is where the stalemate is. I could get  
21 the information from these fellows and the claim would  
22 be processed inside of ten days. Now it is taking  
23 three weeks to a month to get an answer.

24 MR. GUTHRIE: You are saying really then  
25 that you want to be able to go to a particular man or  
26 one or two men with regard to all your claims rather  
27 than having to deal with the individual claims officer  
28 who may have a particular claim?

29 MR. CULLITON: I am saying this is what  
30 we have done in the past. I don't want any flavouring





Nethercut & Young

2954

Toronto, Ontario

1 that by doing this we were getting favours or anything  
2 like that. This was strictly business.

3 MR. GUTHRIE: That is not suggested.

4 MR. CULLITON: But this proved that we  
5 could process a claim a lot faster than the claims are  
6 being processed today.

7 MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Culliton, can you tell  
8 me in particular cases you have been familiar with how  
9 long it has taken to get, say, from the rejection of a  
10 claim to the review committee and then from the review  
11 committee to the Appeal Tribunal? What lapse of time  
12 have you experienced in actual cases that you have dealt  
13 with?

14 MR. CULLITON: I won't go into specific  
15 cases because there have been in all the cases I have  
16 handled gradually the time growing longer and longer.  
17 I would say to progress a claim to the top tribunal would  
18 be over a month right now.

19 MR. GUTHRIE: By the top tribunal do  
20 you mean the Appeal Tribunal?

21 MR. CULLITON: The Appeal Tribunal, yes.

22 MR. GUTHRIE: It strikes me that is  
23 pretty prompt.

24 MR. CULLITON: We could do it inside of  
25 six or seven days before.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: You are talking now  
27 about your second level of appeal. Your second level of  
28 appeal before in the days when you used to go to the  
29 Board must have taken a substantial time.

30 MR. CULLITON: Well, we didn't go to the





Nethercut & Young

2955

Toronto, Ontario

1 Board because there was no necessity. By going to the  
2 senior officers and asking them why they turned the  
3 claim down was it medical and possibly a claim for lack  
4 of information, a man gets hurt on the job, some clerk  
5 in the yard office would fill out his 3903 or his  
6 accident form. There would be a lack of information.  
7 The claimant would be turned down, so we would write to  
8 Mr. Crisp<sup>1/</sup> or those fellows in the office who we were  
9 dealing with and they would send us back the information.  
10 So we would go to the yard office, go to the man, and he  
11 would resubmit another form and the claim would go  
12 through for compensation. Now today if it is turned down  
13 where does it go --- it goes to the next step and it is  
14 turned down. We are finding out a lot of these fellows  
15 haven't been coming to us, they have been appealing it  
16 on their own.

17 MR. GUTHRIE: What you are really saying  
18 is, I think, that under your former system you were  
19 really able to avoid the formal appeal structure all  
20 together by means of an informal adjustment.

21 MR. CULLITON: There was no necessity  
22 of going that high, that is right, we stopped at the  
23 review committee.

24 MR. GUTHRIE: Perhaps it is not so much  
25 the newness of the appeal system as against the old  
26 appeal system as it is the problem of direct access to  
27 Board members. I think that is the thing which is pin-  
28 pointed, that one thing.

29 MR. CULLITON: I think this new system  
30 is not working as good as the old system.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2956

1  
2 MR. GUTHRIE: The Commissioner suggested  
3 if you have some examples of correspondence indicating  
4 delays that you might care to send them down to us, Mr.  
5 Culliton, and we would be glad to consider them.

6 MR. CULLITON: We can do that, yes.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

8 MR. GUTHRIE: Most of the employees  
9 that your union represents are, I presume, covered by  
10 Schedule 2 of the Act, the employers would be individually  
11 liable to take compensation.

12 MR. CULLITON:: Yes.

13 MR. GUTHRIE: Perhaps I should not say  
14 this, but it struck me you made no comment one way or the  
15 other about that feature of the particular situation.  
16 Have you anything to say on whether it works or it  
17 doesn't, Schedule 2?

18 MR. CULLITON: Well, we have never  
19 discussed this part of it and did not have it in our  
20 brief, so I don't think that I could make any comment on  
21 that whatsoever.

22 MR. GUTHRIE: Thank you very much. Do  
23 any of your other members care to make any further  
24 comments?

25 MR. MARTINDALE: I don't think so. I  
26 think it would just be a repetition of what we have  
27 already gone through. I think Mr. Culliton has really  
28 done a remarkable job in covering everything and unless  
29 Mr. Hounsome or Mr. Devlin has anything further to say.

30 MR. CULLITON: : Thank you very much.





Nethercut & Young

2957

Toronto, Ontario

1 THE COMMISSIONER: We will adjourn for  
2 five minutes.  
3

4 ----Short recess.  
5

6 MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Commissioner, so far as  
7 I am aware there are still four parties present who wish  
8 to be heard briefly --- Mr. Burnett and his colleagues  
9 on behalf of the railways, Mr. Osler on behalf of  
10 International Nickel, Mr. Craigs of the Ontario Federation  
11 of Labour, Mr. Samson of the Construction Safety  
12 Association. I hope I am not omitting anyone else who  
13 still wishes to speak. I understand that all four  
14 intend to be brief and all four are hoping to be dealt  
15 with first and immediately, but I think we have ample  
16 time probably before the noon adjournment to hear them all,  
17 so perhaps Mr. Burnett and his colleagues would like to  
18 proceed with the brief comment they have now on the  
19 question of subrogation of third party liability.

20 MR BURNETT: I understand, my lord, that  
21 the City of Toronto yesterday filed a brief making certain  
22 recommendations, largely procedural, I believe. Most of  
23 it I have no comment on, I agree with, but there is one  
24 aspect that I think I should register a difference on.  
25 This relates to the point as to actions against third  
26 parties. Now, put briefly it is the recommendation of  
27 the City that any sums that are recovered in litigation  
28 in excess of the monies that have been paid by the  
29 employer one way or the other, administrative expenses,  
30 medical aid and compensation, should then become the  
property of the injured employee.





Nethercut & Young

2958

Toronto, Ontario

1 THE COMMISSIONER: It becomes his  
2 property without any strings.

3 MR. BURNETT: Yes.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: I suppose what you  
5 are about to suggest is that it should be returned as  
6 a credit against any further compensation that might be  
7 awarded?

8 MR. BURNETT: That is what we do in  
9 practice, but I think the fundamental point, sir, is  
10 the same as the Board --- you will notice that under  
11 Schedule 1 any amount recovered by the Board is by the  
12 statute paid into the fund, not to the Board as such.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: By statute that is the  
14 case, but in practice that is not what they do, is it?

15 MR. BURNETT: Regardless of what they  
16 do in practice the statute is that it goes to the fund  
17 and thereby presumably it reduces the charges against  
18 the entire class. I presume that would be the result of  
19 it. We are talking about a fairly small group of cases  
20 in the whole scheme.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: What is that section  
22 of the Act, do you know?

23 MR. BURNETT: 9, sir, subsection (3) at  
24 the top of page 4 of the printed copy. Subsection (3),  
25 the last two lines, leaving out the first part:

26 "and any sum recovered by him  
27 shall form part of the accident  
28 fund".

29 THE COMMISSIONER: In practice, Mr.  
30 Kerr, have we not been told that you do pay over the





Nethercut & Young

2959

Toronto, Ontario

1 excess amount to the man?

2 MR. KERR: That is correct, sir. We do  
3 pay the excess amount to the injured person on the  
4 understanding that it is a credit against any further  
5 compensation payments or medical aid that might be  
6 necessary in that particular case.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps you are  
8 exceeding your jurisdiction.

9 MR. BURNETT: Well, that is not my point  
10 this morning. My point is that the proceeds have been  
11 for years, and I think just because it is history does  
12 not make it bad, have not been those of the employer  
13 because we have to bear in mind this, that the employee  
14 who is injured does have this election. He can proceed  
15 in his own suit if he wishes to against a third party.  
16 The action of the employer follows upon the election and  
17 the matter of subrogation. He proceeds and if he  
18 recovers less than the amount paid in compensation he is  
19 just left with that loss. In most cases, in fact 100 to  
20 1, there is no suit, no recovery, but by this means the  
21 employer has a chance of gaining something in his own  
22 fund for losses. If the employee is, as a matter of  
23 right, entitled to have this excess, then, of course,  
24 he can't really lose on that deal. If the railway goes  
25 ahead and recoups themselves, they pay the expenses of  
26 it, and if by chance they are successful and the employee  
27 wins it, if by chance the railway is not successful, the  
28 employee can say very naturally, "Well, that was a good  
29 try, but it is their loss". I think the fundamental  
30 thing is in the principle.





1 It has come before our courts in  
2 the past. I don't want to quote law here this morning.  
3 As your lordship is probably aware, there was an  
4 exceedingly good review of all the principles --- I won't  
5 try to read it this morning --- in Cooper and Canadian  
6 Northern Ontario Railway Company in 1923, 55 O.L.R.,  
7 256. It was a rather lengthy judgment by Mr. Justice  
8 Orr but he reviews the entire principles of the matter  
9 saying quite clearly that this extra fund is the  
10 employer's. All I am suggesting here is in our cases  
11 I think it is a matter of practice there is no question  
12 that we first of all give the employee for certain the  
13 amount that is spread between his compensation wage and  
14 his actual wage, that goes to him. The other sum is  
15 very often paid, but all I say is that it is at the  
16 discretion of the employer to have it said that he must  
17 give this back and you are distorting the entire system.  
18 That is where I disagree with the brief of the City.  
19 Mind you, I am fully cognizant of the fact that Mr.  
20 Justice Roach ---

21 THE COMMISSIONER: It was also discussed  
22 by Mr. Justice Roach.

23 MR. BURNETT: Yes, I am aware of that.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: He felt, and I can  
25 understand the reasoning behind it, that it was wrong for  
26 the employer to be able to recover and keep something  
27 that was awarded for pain and suffering or due to  
28 disability.

29 MR. BURNETT: With all respect, I think  
30 where his lordship perhaps erred was that this is an





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2961

1 election that the employee has made. He can go on and  
2 collect those amounts if he wishes, but he has taken  
3 the sure step, the insured step of compensation. In a  
4 sense under the new system he is going to get the best  
5 of two worlds. I am not opposing that submission, but I  
6 do say that the employer is entitled to this as the  
7 Board is, and I would say the Board is charged with  
8 allocating this excess to the fund and it goes to  
9 reduce the charges that the employer has, be it the  
10 Board on the one hand, or the employee on the other hand.

11 I think the lines are drawn on two  
12 sides.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: I have the impression  
14 that you were saying in many cases I thought you said in  
15 practically all cases that you were actually returning  
16 the excess as it is.

17 MR. BURNETT: In many cases, but it is  
18 not the invariable rule, I would not say that, to go  
19 against future claims.

20 I don't believe there were any other  
21 points in the brief that we sharply differentiate from.  
22 There is a suggestion, I am not quite clear what they  
23 mean on page 6 where they suggest that the action should  
24 be brought to recover the expenses of the employer. That  
25 comes closer to the Quebec system really.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: It kind of gets pretty  
27 involved. I mean if it is to recover the legal costs  
28 that in some cases could be fairly easily arrived at,  
29 but to get at the administrative costs it might become  
30 involved.





Nethercut & Young

2962

Toronto, Ontario

1                           MR. BURNETT: Perhaps it would not be  
2 too involved, my lord. There would be about an 8 or 9  
3 percent charge for those but there is this question that  
4 is raised here. I must confess that in no third party  
5 proceedings have I had any trouble in this regard, but  
6 there is this distinction between compensation and  
7 medical aid. Under Section 9 the action is a subrogation  
8 action. Now, in fact it might well be said that the  
9 employee who is injured did not himself lose the medical  
10 expenses. I am thinking more of medical than I am of  
11 the others.

12                          THE COMMISSIONER: You support the  
13 argument of the City of Toronto on that basis?

14                          MR. BURNETT: Except that I think that  
15 it should be done in here like the subrogation together  
16 with the medical aid and administrative costs; in other  
17 words, that is an annex to subrogation costs. We are  
18 still back at Section 9 (3), my lord. If their action  
19 is based solely on one of subrogation.

20                          THE COMMISSIONER: What you want is a  
21 definition of "compensation" somewhat larger?

22                          MR. BURNETT: Well, not quite, my lord.

23                          THE COMMISSIONER: Compensation as it  
24 appears in this section.

25                          MR. BURNETT: No, I don't think that is  
26 quite my point, sir. The compensation as such loses all  
27 its import when you come into a third party action. Then  
28 you are only suing ---

29                          THE COMMISSIONER: That is what I am  
30 saying, in the third party action you want the definition





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2963

1 of "workmen's compensation" to include medical and  
2 administrative costs?

3 MR. BURNETT: Believe me I am not  
4 quibbling on this. When you are suing a third party you  
5 are ~~suing~~ for losses sustained by the workman as such.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Ordinarily you won't  
7 indicate that there was any compensation paid at all.

8 MR. BURNETT: I don't think it even  
9 comes into it because the courts have said that is not  
10 relevant.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You are suing for his  
12 wages.

13 MR. BURNETT: And his pain and suffering  
14 and everything he would be entitled to in common law.  
15 But a defendant in that action who is the wrongdoer, as  
16 the brief says here, can say, "Well, this is subrogation,  
17 he incurred no expenses for medical, no obligation".  
18 All I am suggesting here is that in addition to the  
19 subrogation of right the employer also has the right to  
20 add to that in the subrogation action "including medical  
21 expenses, medical aid, in addition to subrogation", to  
22 clarify it that the action is not only for subrogation  
23 of the rights of the workman because in that case there  
24 would be no right possibly to claim against the  
25 wrongdoer who has done the damage for medical aid. There  
26 is no reason in the world why the wrongdoer who has  
27 injured the workman should not have to reimburse for the  
28 medical aid that he caused.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: I understand the  
30 criticism. I think there should be some clarification





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2964

1 and I am just trying to find out from you how you suggest  
2 it should be worded.

3 MR. BURNETT: Well, I would think  
4 subsection (3) of Section 9, at the top of page 8:

5 "is subrogated the right to maintain  
6 an action and a means for and against  
7 it", et cetera, et cetera, " and  
8 the right to reimburse for medical  
9 payments".

10 And, if you wish: "the administration costs".

11 MR. GUTHRIE: I think this is the point  
12 the City makes at the top of page 6 of its brief, Mr.  
13 Burnett, is it not?

14 MR. BURNETT: I think in part it is, but  
15 he seems to be going --- in other words, I am not saying  
16 that we should be claiming for all payments made to or  
17 on behalf of the workmen. That would include compensation.  
18 You see, in that action the plaintiff is not claiming  
19 compensation in the way it is defined in the Act: He  
20 is claiming loss of wages, pain and suffering. I think  
21 the City here when they wrote this one were thinking of  
22 the alternative method they are suggesting here of  
23 bringing an action only for the payments that have been  
24 made which is very similar to the Quebec system --- two  
25 actions, one by the employer to recover the amounts that  
26 we have paid or the capitalized value that has been paid  
27 and then there is another action by the defendants for  
28 the ancillary losses, that is a secondary action.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: What is the suggested  
30 amendment that you made --- "such action" ---?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2965

1 MR. BURNETT: "Such action may include  
2 a claim for medical aid", and I would add "administration  
3 expenses" whether or not such have been incurred by the  
4 workman.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Whether or not there  
6 were claims for which the workman was personally liable?

7 MR. BURNETT: Yes.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

9 MR. BURNETT: I think those are the only  
10 points that I wish to draw to your lordship's attention  
11 in the brief. The rest of it I concur with. I would not  
12 go against their proposals.

13 MR. OSLER: Sir, at the time we last  
14 appeared Mr. Estey asked me the question, if I recall ---  
15 I am sorry I don't see him here today --- he asked me a  
16 question in regard to Tables 10 and 11, the figures which  
17 had been supplied by Mr. Kerr, I think, to the  
18 Commission which ~~were~~ not seen at that time. These were  
19 subsequently supplied to me by Mr. Kerr and those tables  
20 related to the number of compensable cases, 1960-1965 for  
21 the rate numbers 076 which is our nickel rate 305, the  
22 motor vehicle, and Schedule 1.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: You didn't notice  
24 what exhibit numbers they went in under, did you?

25 MR. OSLER: I couldn't tell you, sir.  
26 I think they were sheets filed by the Board, sir, tables.  
27 I don't think they went in as an exhibit.

28 Sir, I have very little to say. I  
29 believe the question Mr. Estey was going to ask was how  
30 would I account for the increase in the cases that appear





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2966

1 in Table 10 from a low in 1963 to the rather high figure  
2 in 1965 provisional, jumping from 900 up to 1,800.

3 Basically, I don't think we can supply  
4 an explanation.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: I am not following you.  
6 We are looking at Table 10?

7 MR. OSLER: Table 10. You see, in 1963 --

8 THE COMMISSIONER: 1963 the number of  
9 cases was 967.

10 MR. OSLER: And in 1965 provisional  
11 1,845.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

13 MR. OSLER: I believe the question Mr.  
14 Estey asked me originally was how would I account for  
15 this apparent sharp increase in these cases during that  
16 short period from 1963 to 1965. I am afraid I have not  
17 got a positive answer because we cannot accept any of the  
18 reasons which might have been advanced. There has not  
19 been an increase in new men, I think our tables that we  
20 filed are Exhibits 26 and 27 which indicate that it is  
21 not a question of older men in the employees suddenly all  
22 going into compensable cases --

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Did you say no  
24 increase in employment?

25 MR. OSLER: In the two years 1963 to  
26 1965, yes, the employment went up by about 2,000 men,  
27 it went up about possibly 25 percent, but don't forget  
28 this was a matter of there were men being recalled to  
29 work as well as new men being hired during that period  
30 of increased employment which took place specifically





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2967

1       in 1964. In relation to other years there is no such  
2       definite increase of new people being unfamiliar with the  
3       workings which would account for this great increase.  
4       There has been no introduction of some machinery or  
5       works which was of such an unusual nature as would account  
6       for it. The safety steps that have been taken by the  
7       company are those which primarily had been in existence  
8       for a number of years. There was no lack of safety  
9       instruction or safety steps. So that our report really  
10      is, sir, that we cannot attribute this to any particular  
11      thing. We have suggested that insofar as the allowable  
12      cases are concerned the change in the Act, of course,  
13      might have had something to do with it.

14                     THE COMMISSIONER: The only way that you  
15      can account for it is the change in the Act that widens  
16      the field of the definition of "accident"?

17                     MR. OSLER: And I think as such our  
18      feeling is that there have been claims made which  
19      have been sufficiently wide that it is recognized that  
20      the field is wider. That was the only question asked by  
21      Mr. Estey.

22                     MR. GUTHRIE: Just on that last point,  
23      Mr. Osler, you mean that as it becomes known among the  
24      work force that the interpretation is broader this may  
25      actually encourage claims that would otherwise not have  
26      been filed?

27                     MR. OSLER: There is no other logical  
28      explanation.

29                     MR. GUTHRIE: I think you already dealt  
30      with the question about whether it had anything to do with





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2968

1 the ageing of the work force.

2 MR. OSLER: We examined that and I think  
3 we found in our exhibit, I think Exhibit 26 or 27,  
4 information which would indicate that basically,  
5 certainly in the back tests, it is the degree of  
6 frequency in the younger men than in the older men.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: When did the change  
8 in the Act occur?

9 MR. OSLER: 1963, sir.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: And your experience  
11 from 1950 to 1963 was that your accident rate was  
12 improving year by year?

13 MR. OSLER: It has increased almost 100  
14 percent in the last two years.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: It certainly goes up  
16 100 percent within two years.

17 MR. OSLER: That is right.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

19 MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Osler, were there some  
20 other matters that you wanted to refer to in the  
21 transcript?

22 MR. OSLER: No, I had discussed with the  
23 company a few odd matters, but I thought I would perhaps  
24 write a letter to Mr. Estey because they are so petty  
25 and I don't think it is worthwhile wasting the time of  
26 the Commission. I hope to finish the letter this  
27 afternoon and it will be in your hands tomorrow morning.

28 MR. GUTHRIE: Thank you, Mr. Osler.

29

30





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2969

5/BL/SS

1 Mr. Craigs (Ontario Federation of Labour).

2 MR. CRAIGS: My face, of course, is  
3 familiar to you. This is Mr. Henry Weisbach.

4 Mr. Commissioner, since you have  
5 opened these hearings we have canvassed our affiliates,  
6 some 1,200 of them, and as a consensus we have two main  
7 points we would wish to bring to your attention.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: You say you have  
9 1,200 affiliates?

10 MR. CRAIGS: Yes, which represents  
11 about 1,500 members. There are two main points about  
12 The Workmen's Compensation Act of Ontario which the  
13 membership is greatly concerned with. With your  
14 permission, the first one is Section 41, sir.

15 It is our contention, Mr. Commissioner,  
16 that a workman obviously must be on a payroll and  
17 performing his regular work to be entitled to benefits  
18 under the provisions of the Act. Therefore, it is our  
19 opinion that the Act was intended to provide full  
20 compensation benefits until such time as the workman was  
21 ready to return to his regular employment or until he  
22 was in a fit condition to obtain employment through his  
23 trade union or the National Employment Service, or what  
24 is now known as the Manpower Service.

25 Surely we cannot expect some other  
26 employer or even his own employer to make a position for  
27 him during the balance of his period of temporary  
28 disability. Many employers just could not make a  
29 suitable temporary job, and in the case of construction  
30 workers, workmen in bush operations and somewhat similar





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2970

1 types of employment, it is practically impossible to have  
2 some other employer provide some type of work other than  
3 the man's regular duties for some temporary period.  
4 We recommend that serious consideration be given to the  
5 abolition of Section 41 as it applies to the 50% payment  
6 of compensation due to a man's ability to perform light  
7 work.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: What is the situation  
9 in other provinces? Have you given consideration to that?

10 MR. CRAIGS: No, sir, we haven't. We  
11 have been primarily concerned with the situation in  
12 Ontario.

13 The other question is the question of  
14 the Appeals Tribunal. It has become evident as you have  
15 sat through these hearings that there is a change in  
16 the administration of the Board's operations which is  
17 causing a great deal of heartburn, to say the least of it.  
18 I would draw your attention, sir, to the fact that Sir  
19 William Meredith, in recommending the type of system  
20 which has been in effect in Ontario for some years,  
21 highlighted the proposed system by stating it was his  
22 intention that the system would provide speedy justice.  
23 The new appeal system through which a workman must  
24 process his claim has not made a significant contribution  
25 to speedy adjudication of a claim.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: We keep hearing this.  
27 The Board contends that it is speedier. They deny that  
28 there are any delays. Now, as to the situation at the  
29 appeal level, again it is denied that it is any slower  
30 than it was, that it may be faster than it was, that is in





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2971

1 days when the last court of appeal was the Board itself.  
2 Is what you mean to say tht the delay in the time when  
3 the man can be heard personally or can have a personal  
4 hearing before the Board is much longer than it used to  
5 be?

6 MR. CRAIGS: Yes, this is essentially  
7 our position, sir. When this new system was originally  
8 introduced there was, as in any other situation where  
9 substantial change is made, a considerable amount of  
10 disruption. A new chairman took over and he brought new  
11 ideas with him, and there was obviously needed a shake-  
12 down period when the subordinate staff could become  
13 acquainted with the new system. There is always the  
14 difficulty when changing from a long-established system  
15 to a new system. There were initial difficulties at the  
16 first stage of the claim due to this changeover. While  
17 it is true, and I don't deny it, that the time in which  
18 there is a rejection of a claim and it is sent to a  
19 review board may not be significant, we find that the  
20 main difficulty is between the review board and the  
21 Appeals Tribunal. It follows, Mr. Commissioner, where  
22 a group of three individuals are wholly concerned with the  
23 adjudication of appeals, are required to travel all over  
24 this province, we do not think that it is possible for  
25 them (a) to receive these claims due to sheer work load,  
26 that there must be correspondence between the decision  
27 of the Review Committee and the decision of the workman  
28 to appeal his claim. An Appeals Tribunal should review  
29 the files before it actually hears a claim. This  
30 obviously is a time factor, too, and, as a result, all





Nethercut & Young

2972

Toronto, Ontario

1 along the line there is an accumulation of delays. We do  
2 not say these are deliberate, but it is due to the  
3 procedure, due to bureaucracy, perhaps.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: One would have  
5 expected to hear from labour representatives that this  
6 new system of taking the appeal out to the sticks, so  
7 to speak, taking it to the various parts of Ontario,  
8 would have been appreciated as maybe an improvement, but  
9 I haven't heard any comment about it at all.

10 MR. CRAIGS: The only trouble is that  
11 the Appeal Tribunal cannot be in two places at once; it  
12 cannot be in Windsor and Kapuskasing simultaneously.  
13 This element in procedures must produce delay; and I  
14 think it is true, without being overly sentimental about  
15 it, that it causes anguish, and it often produces hard-  
16 ship in many cases. In fact, if I go over the page, sir,  
17 we make the point that with three, perhaps four, hearings  
18 a day before the Appeal Tribunal, there is little time  
19 to spare for the more contentious cases. As a result,  
20 we feel that many workmen feel thwarted. If, in your  
21 judgment, the present system should be retained we would  
22 urge that you consider the establishment of a second  
23 Tribunal in order that one of them be "on tour"  
24 constantly.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: That is the first  
26 time I have heard that suggestion. It sounds as though  
27 it may be a reasonable suggestion, but perhaps the Board  
28 should be allowed an opportunity to show that this  
29 system can work and can work to the satisfaction of your  
30 people, in which event a suggestion of this kind might





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2973

1 be of substantial value.

2 MR. CRAIGS: Well, I do quite a bit of  
3 representation, as Mr. Kerr knows, and in my experience  
4 in the province they are becoming perhaps a little  
5 arduous. The comprehension, the education, the under-  
6 standing of a workman in, say, Kenora is not necessarily  
7 that of a fairly sophisticated fellow who works at the  
8 Ford Plant at Oakville. There is also this question of  
9 the feeling of remoteness. Northern Ontario feels  
10 extremely neglected, rightly or wrongly, but it feels  
11 so. I have a case in Dryden which has been going on for  
12 three years, and the Act requires that this claimant,  
13 in order to be heard before the full Board, must be  
14 heard here, and he must come from Dryden at his own  
15 expense. He must come to Toronto for the full Board.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: The full Board is  
17 how many people?

18 MR. CRAIGS: The Chairman, the Vice-  
19 Chairman and the Commissioner.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: I understood what  
21 you were talking about here was a branch of the Appeal  
22 Tribunal.

23 MR. CRAIGS: Yes, sir. I merely drew  
24 that illustration to show the feeling of remoteness and  
25 the difficulty and hardship that can be entailed.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: In other words, what-  
27 ever we might eventually end up with, you would approve  
28 of some measure of travel being continued.

29 MR. CRAIGS: If, in your judgment, the  
30 tribunal system should be maintained, then quite obviously





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2974

1 one tribunal is not enough.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: If it wasn't maintained  
3 and we are back to the old system, there would be nobody  
4 travelling around, would there?

5 MR. CRAIGS: No, sir.

6 There is just one remaining point that  
7 the membership has expressed concern about, and that is  
8 the tendency towards formality in hearings.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: I suppose it is  
10 inevitable. The bigger an organization gets the more  
11 lack of personal contact you get.

12 MR. CRAIGS: I wouldn't want to instruct  
13 an eminent jurist like yourself, sir, but I think it is  
14 important we recognize one basic thing, that where  
15 formality creeps in there is a tendency for the adversary  
16 system to introduce itself.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: And a tendency to  
18 bureaucracy, too; you have a ladder.

19 MR. CRAIGS: Yes. This may seem  
20 difficult for many people to grasp, that there is a very  
21 real concern, almost a fear, that the adversary system  
22 will creep in and this leads to the introduction of  
23 legal counsel and the laws of examination and cross-  
24 examination.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Everybody agrees  
26 that that should be avoided if possible. But what we  
27 are up against is how are we going to handle the volume.

28 MR. CRAIGS: We took the liberty of  
29 drawing this to your attention, because there is quite a  
30 consensus of feeling in our membership on these three





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2975

1 points.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: You recall this  
3 inquiry by the Labour Safety Council and the Accident  
4 Prevention Associations in 1965. This report only came  
5 to my attention in the last several weeks. I see that  
6 during the course of that inquiry the Ontario Federation  
7 of Labour reported that they had a question sent to their  
8 unions regarding safety committees in the plants, how  
9 many had safety committees in the plant, how many there  
10 were where there were union representatives appointed to  
11 the committee, and how many collective agreements as to  
12 safety, and how many cases there were where the local  
13 union on safety education worked. There was a very  
14 interesting comment on the situation at that time. That  
15 situation would be probably in 1964. Have we had anything  
16 since that time?

17 MR. CRAIGS: Mr. Weisbach is a member  
18 of the Safety Council, sir.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: This was an excellent  
20 effort by the Safety Council.

21 MR. WEISBACH: I just want to say that  
22 since the report of the Safety Council has been  
23 published a new Safety Council has been appointed. But I  
24 was the person in the Federation who sent out the  
25 questionnaire and made the particular summary for the  
26 Council. I don't recall the exact percentage, but I think  
27 it was 30% or 40% of our local unions who took part in  
28 active safety education.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Your memory is very  
30 good, because it says 32%.





Nethercut & Young

2976

Toronto, Ontario

1                           MR. WEISBACH: Since then, of course,  
2 this has changed considerably because the efforts of the  
3 Federation in the field of safety education have been  
4 stepped up to a large extent. I would say the  
5 percentage of local unions and similar labour bodies  
6 participating in safety education is considerably higher.  
7 I couldn't offhand say what percentage it is.

8                           THE COMMISSIONER: In other words, the  
9 labour unions realize that always in the past they hadn't  
10 done as much and they are now prepared to do as much as  
11 they can to make it go now.

12                          MR. WEISBACH: That is correct. I think  
13 we admitted quite openly at the Safety Council at that  
14 time that we possibly did not always pull our share, but  
15 since then we have participated more in the activities.  
16 Also I think it can be said we have established a some-  
17 what closer cooperation with the Safety and Accident  
18 Prevention Associations. I think there is an actual  
19 exchange of ideas takes places more than it has up to  
20 this time. But it is progressing satisfactorily.

21                          THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much,  
22 Mr. Weisbach.

23                          MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Samson.

24                          MR. SAMSON: Mr. Commissioner, I have  
25 left with you a copy of a letter that I would like to  
26 read, if I may, dated November the 28th, to the  
27 Honourable George A. McGillivray, The Royal Commission  
28 on The Workmen's Compensation Ac .

29                          THE COMMISSIONER: You are reading in  
30 a letter. This is your own letter?





Nethercut & Young

2977

Toronto, Ontario

1

MR. SAMSON: Yes, sir.

2

We would like to reply to the Royal

3

Commission in connection with our appearance on November  
4 2nd.

5

In the first instance we would like to  
6 draw attention to two errors in the transcript of the  
7 hearings of that day - namely on page 2827 - line 13, the  
8 figure should read 4,949 laborers rather than 499.

9

On Page 2833 on line 28 it should read  
10 "approximately 25" rather than 85. There are  
11 approximately 25 different craft unions in the  
12 construction industry and over 500 "locals" in the  
13 province.

14

We would like to draw the attention of  
15 the Royal Commission to allegations made by Mr. Gallagher  
16 both in the press and in the transcript. We are  
17 attaching a photostat of an article in the Toronto  
18 Telegram dated November 3, 1966, with the caption  
19 "Laborer's Union Accuses Safety Head". On page 2860 of  
20 the transcript - line 12 Mr. Gallagher quotes "and I feel  
21 very strongly that the presentation this morning is not  
22 very accurate".

23

Contrary to the allegations of Mr.  
24 Gallagher in the press and in the transcript our testimony  
25 was accurate. Mr. Gallagher's statement is irresponsible  
26 and has made an attempt to mislead the Commission.

27

In the newspaper article I have been  
28 accused personally of misinforming the Commission. This  
29 is wrong. Mr. Gallagher as quoted in the article in  
30 the Telegram - "I feel very strongly that the information





Nethercut & Young

Toronto, Ontario

2978

1      this morning was not very reliable," he told the chairman  
2      Mr. Justice McGillivray, concerning safety inspectors on  
3      subway jobs. "There is not a TTC inspector at all and  
4      what safety inspectors there are are dominated by the  
5      contractors." At no time did we say that the TTC have  
6      a safety inspector on the subway. Our understanding is  
7      that the TTC do not have a safety director but that it is  
8      a "condition of contract" with the contractors that they  
9      must supply safety directors while performing contract  
10     work on the subway. The contractor hires a safety man for  
11     the job and the contractors pays his wages. The innuendo  
12     that the safety directors are dominated by the contractors  
13     is wrong. They are employed by the contractors and paid  
14     by the contractors. The only inspectors on the subway  
15     are either municipal or provincial and they have the  
16     power of enforcement.

17                The safety program is not under the  
18     thumb of the contractor. The contractor's responsibility  
19     is to provide proper safety programming.

20                The article in the Telegram referred  
21     to herein quotes Mr. Gallagher as saying that the writer  
22     is hired by the contractors. This is not true. The  
23     General Manager of the Construction Safety Association  
24     of Ontario is hired by the elected directors of the  
25     Association and the General Manager is not responsible  
26     to any contractor but rather to the elected directors  
27     of the Association. The objective and responsibility  
28     of the Association is not strictly to the contractors but  
29     to some 200,000 construction workers in the industry.

30                Further Mr. Gallagher is quoted "He is





Nethercut & Young

2979

Toronto, Ontario

1 only an image (Samson). His association is not  
2 effective and never will be until the laborers are  
3 represented." This is a complete fallacy. The  
4 Association is indeed effective and the fact that it is  
5 directed by some 58 contractor-directors shows maturity  
6 and a responsible attitude in this province towards the  
7 safety of men on construction sites.

8 Again Mr. Gallagher is quoted "Why, if  
9 this was so successful, doesn't his association continue  
10 to work with us all year round?" This was in reference  
11 to a safety crusade in Toronto last May.

12 Mr. Gallagher asks the question and then  
13 answers it himself - "It's because it wants to keep  
14 control under management."

15 The fact of the matter is that we do  
16 work with labour the whole year round. The safety of the  
17 labour force and every man in the construction industry  
18 is our whole concern. Management provides the safety  
19 education for the industry. The objectives are single.  
20 The creation and development of effective safety  
21 education for both construction workers and the contrac-  
22 tors. It is paid by management through their assessments  
23 to the Workmen's Compensation Board.

24 Because these allegations have appeared  
25 in the public press as well as in the transcript of the  
26 Royal Commission proceedings we strongly request that our  
27 rebuttal be recorded.

28 In all common decency we would expect a  
29 retraction by Mr. Gallagher of these allegations so that  
30 they may be included in the records of the Royal





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2980

Commission.

We respectfully submit this request.

# Laborer's Union accuses safety head

THE TELEGRAM, Toronto, Thur., Nov. 3, 1966

Gerald Gallagher, Toronto secretary of the Laborers International Union, yesterday accused the general safety inspectors on sub-

jects of the Ontario Construction Safety Association of misinforming a Royal Commission on the Workmen's Compensation Act.

I feel very strongly that the information this morning was not very reliable," he told chairman Mr. Justice McGillivray, concerning safety inspectors on sub-

jects of the Ontario Construction Safety Association of misinforming a Royal Commission on the Workmen's Compensation Act.

"Gil (Gilbert Samson of the Construction Safety Association) is hated by the contractors," Mr. Gallagher said.

"He is only an image. His association is not effective and never will be until the laborers are represented."

Mr. Sampson earlier told the commission that a safety crusade in Toronto last May had proved very effective, partly because of the assistance given by labor.

"Why, if this was so successful, doesn't his association continue to work with us all year round?" questioned Mr. Gallagher and then answered himself.

"It's because it wants to keep control under management."

Hearings ended today but Mr. Justice McGillivray said he would be available later in the month for any new evidence.

Mr. Gallagher immediately said his union would take advantage of this, but the commissioner warned him he would not allow "any personal remarks."

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2981

1 THE COMMISSIONER: As far as the last  
2 paragraph is concerned, we told Mr. Gallagher that we  
3 were not going to get into name-calling here; and I  
4 think by the same token this Commission is not concerned  
5 with whether Mr. Gallagher makes a retraction or whether  
6 he doesn't, whether he makes an apology.

7 MR. SAMSON: Well, my first reaction and  
8 the reaction of my directors was that we would ignore  
9 this, but then we began to feel that this is a permanent  
10 record.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You are quite  
12 justified in coming here and reading into the record  
13 what you read in, with the exception of the last  
14 paragraph, which I don't feel is necessary. I don't feel  
15 we are called upon to comment on it.

16 MR. SAMSON: I would like to leave with  
17 the Commission a report of a study of Construction  
18 Safety Advertising Penetration conducted in November,  
19 1965, by Canadian Facts Limited.

20 MR. GUTHRIE: If I am not mistaken, Mr.  
21 Samson, that was something you were asked to file.

22 MR. SAMSON: Yes, that is right, and I  
23 don't think we had done so.

24 ---EXHIBIT NO. 52:

25 Report of a Study of Construc-  
26 tion Safety Advertising  
27 Penetration dated November,  
28 1965, conducted by Construction  
29 Safety Associations.

30 MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Commissioner, I think  
that all parties interested in making any sort of





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2982

1 rebuttal or reply have been afforded an opportunity to  
2 do so and have been heard. But before the hearings close,  
3 Mr. Kerr of the Workmen's Compensation Board would like  
4 to make a brief closing statement to the Commissioner.

5 MR. KERR: Mr. Commissioner, the Board  
6 and staff members of the Workmen's Compensation Board  
7 are dedicated to service and provide service for the  
8 injured of the working people of Ontario. In so doing we  
9 also provide service for the employers of Ontario. This  
10 service takes place both before the accident occurs and  
11 after the accident occurs. The service that we provide  
12 in the field of safety education is most important  
13 because we also believe it is better to stop an accident  
14 than to compensate a man having an accident. We are  
15 also interested in continuing our education service so  
16 that employers and employees know how to prevent  
17 accidents and how to process claims due to accidents in  
18 employment. Seminars are conducted by management and by  
19 labour, and we are most interested in continuing our  
20 activities so we can spread information about The  
21 Workmen's Compensation Act and what is required to  
22 enable a man to process his claim with the minimum of  
23 delay to obtain benefits.

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2983

6/FJN/SS

1                   It is all in the Act to provide claims,  
2 rehabilitation and medical services and this is our  
3 major responsibility because it fulfills the very purpose  
4 and reason for having a Workmen's Compensation Act. We  
5 also realize in carrying out our responsibilities and  
6 providing these services that we must do it in an  
7 economical, efficient and humane manner. Any compensation  
8 plan requires the complete cooperation of all of those  
9 involved--the Workmen's Compensation Board, the employers,  
10 the doctors and treating professions of Ontario who  
11 provide the treatment facilities for us and in most cases  
12 the cooperation of labour since so many men are members  
13 of labour unions.

14                  This cooperation we feel we have  
15 generally with all groups concerned and it is most  
16 important that this kind of cooperation continue in the  
17 future if we are to be most effective in our work to  
18 assist the injured people.

19                  The Board and staff members are aware of  
20 their responsibilities to the employees and to the  
21 employers and we will continue to provide the best  
22 service possible in an efficient, yet cordial and humane  
23 manner. In dealing with injured workmen we do not regard  
24 them as statistics or claim numbers but as human beings  
25 who come to us with a problem.

26                  Mr. Commissioner, it has been a  
27 pleasure for the Board and senior staff members to  
28 present to you information concerning the various  
29 subjects that have come under review before you.

30                  Thank you, sir.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2984

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Before you go away,  
2 Mr. Kerr, we have been again on this appeal procedure  
3 this morning. Let me recall what the situation is.  
4 How many review committees are there?

5 MR. KERR: This is one review committee,  
6 sir.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Sitting in sections,  
8 is it one or does one review committee review all claims?

9 MR. KERR: One review committee handles  
10 all appeals going through that level.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: How many appeals a  
12 day can that committee handle?

13 MR. KERR: I would have to consult the  
14 records. I believe that was submitted as evidence.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: It ran in my mind  
16 that somebody said ten.

17 MR. GUTHRIE: Mr. Poole said that in  
18 evidence, ten. There are nine members on that committee.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: And I believe you  
20 also gave evidence that if you are having to hear  
21 representations at that level that that would substantially  
22 delay the processing of these appeals.

23 MR. KERR: Yes, it would, sir. Either  
24 that or you would have to increase the number of  
25 personnel on the review committee.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: That is what was  
27 running through my mind. I mean to say, even as things  
28 are with the number of cases you have I don't know how  
29 ten a day gets you through the number of appeals that  
30 you told us this morning which you got.





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2985

1                   MR. KERR: I don't think we stated the  
2 number of appeals this morning, sir; we stated the  
3 number of rejections. But they are not all appealed.

4                   THE COMMISSIONER: In any event, in the  
5 course of a year you are able to get through on ten a  
6 day the number that you have been having as appeals?

7                   MR. KERR: Our evidence which was  
8 submitted by Mr. Poole, if I recall correctly, indicated  
9 that usually it takes about a week for a decision to be  
10 made on the review committee unless it is necessary to  
11 conduct further investigation.

12                  THE COMMISSIONER: It might not be fair  
13 to put these questions to you, but this matter this  
14 morning --- and we have heard it so often --- there is  
15 a sort of loss of contact with the Board until they hit  
16 the final hearing before the Appeal Tribunal. One  
17 wonders if there was some method either by increasing  
18 the number on your review committee or some other way of  
19 allowing these union representatives or others to come  
20 in and make those representations and learn what the  
21 picture is at that stage.

22                  Let us go to another thing. At the  
23 moment if they want to, as they say in the past they  
24 have been able to learn what the trouble was, either that  
25 it was a non-report or something else and as a  
26 consequence be able to advise and maybe avoid an appeal.  
27 Supposing they ---- well, at the moment that matter of  
28 answering questions in the Board itself has been taken  
29 away from the actual people who decide the claims, I  
30 understand, is that right?





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2986

1                   MR. KERR: We have a special group, the  
2 administrative group.

3                   THE COMMISSIONER: It is there for the  
4 sole purpose ----

5                   MR. KERR: ...of providing information  
6 and answering inquiries to let people know where their  
7 claim has failed.

8                   THE COMMISSIONER: They are close to the  
9 claim decision people and they can get this information  
10 quite rapidly and they can tell them wherein their  
11 claim has been found to be deficient at that stage  
12 before it goes on to the Board of Review.

13                  MR. KERR: That is correct, sir. This is  
14 a service which is provided.

15                  THE COMMISSIONER: And I suppose it  
16 is too much to ask you for your comment about this thing  
17 becoming more and more formal.

18                  All right, thank you.

19                  MR. KERR: I think it has been stated  
20 that the attempt is to conduct the hearings in an  
21 orderly manner. I think that is as far as I can go at  
22 this stage, sir.

23                  THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I might have  
24 been wrong, but I did not understand the criticism to be  
25 about the way in which the actual hearings in the Appeal  
26 Tribunal are held; I thought it was more throughout that  
27 this was getting more and more formal and less and less  
28 personal contact.

29                  MR. KERR: Well, there is no doubt that  
30 we do have the three-level appeal system as compared with





1 the two-level appeal system that we had before and we do  
2 have an information service, a group, whereby anyone can  
3 make inquiry to determine what is required and why his  
4 claim was rejected, what is needed to have it  
5 reconsidered or what is needed to bring it within the  
6 terms of the Workmen's Compensation Act. We have many  
7 inquiries, even when a claim has not been submitted ----  
8 what constitutes a claim arising out of and during the  
9 course of employment. This is common knowledge and  
10 everybody should be aware of it, as to the interpretation  
11 of these factors. This is part of our ongoing educational  
12 program, so that people will know what constitutes an  
13 allowable claim under the Act. This is one of the big  
14 advantages of senior officials of the Board being invited  
15 by labour and by management to take part in their  
16 seminars.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Then, what about the  
18 travelling appeal board? Is there any way of keeping  
19 them abreast of work that is going to come up next week,  
20 or do they have to come back to Toronto and settle down  
21 to study this?

22 MR. KERR: Well, there is a Secretary to  
23 the Appeal Tribunal and one of his functions is to  
24 schedule the hearings. As has already been stated, these  
25 hearings are not only held in Toronto, but also  
26 throughout the province and it takes --- I think our  
27 latest figures show that in most cases hearings are held  
28 within four weeks from the time they are scheduled for  
29 a hearing. I use the phrase "when they are scheduled  
30 for a hearing" because many hearings are not held





1 promptly due to a request of the person representing the  
2 injured workman, that they would like more time to  
3 prepare their case and when they are ready they will  
4 then ask for a hearing to be scheduled. When a hearing  
5 is asked to be scheduled it is usually held within four  
6 weeks from the time that the request has been made to  
7 schedule a hearing.

8 It is also true that the members of the  
9 Appeal Tribunal must study the claim and the information  
10 in it before the hearing is held.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You find that  
12 necessary, do you?

13 MR. KERR: Yes, sir.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: They don't sit, then,  
15 I take it five days a week on hearings?

16 MR. KERR: Well, there is time lost in  
17 travelling and, of course, when they come back to the  
18 office for preparation of cases.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Have you  
20 any questions, Mr. Guthrie?

21 MR. GUTHRIE: No, sir, I haven't.

22 Thank you, Mr. Kerr.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Now, there being no  
24 further material to come before this Commission I am now  
25 able to bring the hearings to a close. We have continued  
26 pretty steadily ever since the 26th of September, so we  
27 feel that all those interested should have had an  
28 opportunity of being heard. In the course of this long  
29 series of hearings we have acquired a great mass of  
30 evidence which has to be considered and digested in any





Nethercut & Young  
Toronto, Ontario

2989

1 report that must come from the Commission and this is  
2 something that cannot be done in a hurry apart from the  
3 fact that I try to carry on duties with the court as well.  
4 As a consequence, I cannot promise that this report is  
5 likely to be out in a short period of time. All I can say  
6 is that I will do the best I can because I don't want it  
7 hanging over my head any longer than necessary.

8 I thank all those who have been of  
9 assistance to me in the course of this Commission,  
10 particularly counsel and Mr. Johnston. I have also had  
11 from the Board itself the utmost cooperation on anything  
12 we have asked them to produce here and give in evidence.  
13 I need hardly say that the labour unions, too, have been  
14 very helpful throughout this whole inquiry in the manner  
15 and the type of thing we have heard today.

16 So that concludes the hearings of this  
17 Commission.

18  
19 ---Adjourned.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

















